NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLIII.

AUGUST, 1894.

THE RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH.

BY THE HON. HOKE SMITH, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

If you wish to interest the people of the South to-day, talk to them of the resources and development of their section. Once they enjoyed more the eloquent words of the political orator, but now the plain business presentation of questions connected with material growth finds the most attentive listeners.

The manner in which the Southern States have stood the financial trials of the past eighteen months has directed to them general attention. It has caused careful consideration of the conditions of the section, both by the press and by investors. What progress will the South make in the near future upon the lines of material growth? This question is one which interests all portions of the Union. Careful investigation will cause the answer to be most encouraging to those now already dwelling in that section, and most advantageous to people outside of it.

To properly understand the possibilities of the South, its past, as well as its present, must be considered. Nature has favored it with a climate pleasant in winter, and not oppressive in summer; with a vast expanse of territory suited to every variety of agricultural pursuit; with limitless undeveloped wealth, with ample iron, coal, and lumber, alongside of cotton-fields. It is true that other sections have outstripped it heretofore in

Copyright, 1894, by Lloyd Bryce. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the acquirement of wealth, but this has been due to conditions no longer existing; and now for the first time the whole resources of the South are to assert themselves, freed from any hindering influences.

Experience has taught that the highest progress can only be made when the individual strength of every citizen is developed to its greatest capacity. The producers of wealth are the masses of the people controlled by wise, judicious direction. Any system which takes from the laboring people hope and aspiration lessens proportionately the creative power of the section where they dwell.

The institution of slavery divided the South into three classes; the wealthy slave-owner, cultivated, generous, and brave, but, as a rule, with an income ample for his wants, devoting his time rather to the ornamental than to the practical; the poor whites, competing with slave labor, and with scarcely any opportunity to improve their condition; the slaves themselves, compelled to give to work every hour suited to labor, with no inducement to devise means for increasing results from the application of their energies. What mattered it with them? Increased results would not lessen the hours of their labor or benefit them. They labored for what they ate and what they wore. They received that without regard to what they did. They could not increase it. They were obliged to have it. The work they accomplished was forced from them.

Had it not been for the institution of slavery, checking white immigration and hindering development, the South, with natural resources in its favor in 1860, would have been the greatest manufacturing and mining, as well as agricultural, section of the Union.

In spite of this drawback it is surprising to see what had been accomplished in this section by 1860. At that time the value of the farms of the whole country was $6,000,638,000, of which the farms of the South were valued at $2,300,000,000, they having increased from 1850 to 1860 $1,300,000,000. The agricultural product of the South did not consist of cotton alone, but was of infinite variety. The following table gives a few items from the Census of 1860:

Yield.	In South.	In remainder of the country.
Corn	358,153,000 bushels	472,297,000 bushels
Wheat	44,800,000 "	125,200,000 "
Value animals slaughtered	$84,417,000	$128,424,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The total assessed value of property in the United States in 1860 was $12,000,000,000. Of this the South had $5,200,000,000, nearly one-half. At this time also thirty per cent. of the entire banking capital of the country was in the South.

For four years the armies fought upon Southern soil. The struggle was desperate and the destruction of personal property almost complete. At the close of the war the South had lost many of her best men. Her labor, owing to the change from slavery to freedom, was entirely demoralized. It had been accustomed to idleness except where work was required by the order of the owner. Freed from enforced labor, the first impulse of the negroes was to follow no occupation, but to enjoy the privilege of entire leisure.

Another grievous burden fell upon this section. The negro became at once the tool of designing men who moved South, not for the purpose of finding homes, but to use the freedman as a political tool in obtaining possession of the offices, and to consume by unjust taxation and by official thievery the little which the war had left.

To control the negroes it was necessary to claim their allegiance by reason of the great service rendered in setting them free. It was necessary to fill their minds with distrust and hatred of their former owners, to play upon their prejudices, and to blind them to their best interests. For a number of years this condition existed. The negroes were restless of control and impatient at the thought of labor. Even those who were unable to read aspired to political leadership. But in time some of the men who came South for political control turned their attention to business, and developed into good citizens. The negroes, also, began to realize that they were simply being used as tools, and distrusted their white political leaders.

The negro race had lived for several generations in slavery. During that time great confidence, as a rule, existed between the negro and his master. Many instances could be given of the strong affection felt by the one for the other. It is no reflection upon the race that the circumstances under which they were freed produced a temporary feeling of hostility on the part of the negro towards his former master, but as the hold of the carpet-bagger began to lessen, friction rapidly ceased between the white man and the colored man in the South.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Good government had been restored in nearly every portion of the South by 1880, and for the first time the section could be fairly said to have adjusted itself to the new condition of affairs, and to be in a position for the first time to use its resources to the best practical effect.

To appreciate the terrible loss that the South had endured during these twenty years, it is necessary to remember that the total wealth of the section had depreciated, from 1860 to 1880, by $2,400,000,000, the depreciation having continued during practically the entire time, $300,000,000 of the amount being properly chargeable to the period from 1870 to 1880.

The broad acres of land, however, remained. The mineral resources were still to be developed, and the groundwork from which wealth could be created had been but little injured.

The progress of the South from that time forward may be considered the beginning not of growth by the South, but of growth by the South with free labor, and under the changed conditions which the war produced. The capacity of the white people for endurance, their fortitude and nerve power, had been shown in a manner beyond question. Content to leave the past a memory of pain and pride, again permitted to live free, with hope renewed by honest local government, they regained influence with the colored race, and both sought to develop the section which both recognized as a permanent home. The negroes consider as ridiculous all suggestions for their removal, and, with few exceptions, the whites realize the benefit to the section from the work of this kind and hardy race.

But what has been accomplished since 1880? Referring to all those States classified as Southern in the figures before presented, the Census Reports of 1890 show an increase in assessed value during the preceding ten years of $1,815,000,000, while the increase in true value was $3,893,000,000. In ten years the value of the products of the South increased from $1,200,000,000 to $2,000,000,000.

Omitting, however, some of those States commonly termed Southern, and confining the inquiry to those to which the conditions under consideration most fully applied, the favorable indications from 1880 to 1890 are even proportionately greater.

The following table from data now in the Census Bureau gives for the States named the percentages of increase in true

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

valuation of real and personal property, expenditures for public schools, value of manufactured product, value of farm lands and improvements, and value of farm products.

INCREASE PER CENT., 1880-1890.

	True valuation of real and personal property.	Expenditures of public schools.	Value of manufactured products.	Value of farm lands and improvements.	Value of farm products.
Virginia	21.97	77.26	70.65	17.80	7.61
West Virginia	25.42	78.23	69.25	14.07	5.57
North Carolina	26.71	87.18	109.93	35.48	3.21
South Carolina	24.51	25.32	90.74	44.30	24.89
Georgia	40.66	48.07	89.12	35.83	24.38
Florida	224.57	304.76	228.55	258.49	62.46
Kentucky	29.96	74.26	67.88	15.72	3.29
Tennessee	25.95	65.42	95.16	17.39	A. 11.09
Alabama	45.51	27.38	277.62	40.65	16 47
Mississippi	28.32	61.58	148.80	37.24	15.13
Louisiana	29.66	54.60	138.82	44.74	26.72
Texas	155.22	305.39	239.93	134.63	71.31
Arkansas	59.14	166.33	235.39	59.70	21 31
Aver. percentage	50.76	96.53	108.50	40.68	17.23

(A) Decrease.

The study of these figures indicates the general growth and healthy development not of an old, but of a new country. The development of the South prior to 1860 had been swept away by war, and by the subsequent conditions heretofore described. Its resources were in 1880, and still are, scarcely touched, while those of the Eastern and Middle States are comparatively in use.

The following table, also from the Census Bureau, shows for the states named in it, percentages similar to those considered in connection with the Southern States.

INCREASE PER CENT., 1880-1890.

	True valuation of real and personal property.	Expenditures of public schools.	Value of manufactured products.	Value of farm lands and improvements.	Value of farm products.
Maine	A. 4.28	12.47	19.87	A. 3.70	.47
New Hampshire	A. 10.43	43.35	15.94	A. 12.75	2.13
Vermont	A. 12.06	52.40	22.28	A. 26.45	A. 7.78
Massachusetts	6.89	75 52	40.72	A. 12.76	16 19
Rhode Island	26.04	73.15	36.80	A. 15.49	14.94
Connecticut	7 20	59.06	33.73	A. 21.53	A. .48
New York	35.97	75.03	58.38	A. 8.34	A. 9.23
New Jersey	10.75	69.49	38 84	A. 16.57	A. 2.20
Pennsylvania	25.27	75.57	78.77	A. 5.48	A. 6.50
Ohio	22 03	39.54	84.24	A. 6.87	A. 15.02
Indiana	24.64	30.99	53.25	18.82	A. 17.39
Illinois	57.84	49.78	119.02	25.09	A. 9.42
Aver. percentage	26.83	5.87	62.85	A. 10.06	A. 9.30

(A) Decrease.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps one of the most noticeable indications of progress is the fact that in ten years the public schools of the South increased expenditures 96.53 per cent. All the people of a section must be free and all educated to insure progress. The South is determined that illiteracy in its section shall cease, that every child shall receive a fair education. The percentages taken to-day would be even more striking, but the exact figures cannot be obtained. The one State of Georgia has in the last three years increased her appropriation for public schools more than 100 per cent.

The Southern States show a percentage of increase, during the time considered, in true value of real and personal property, and in value of manufactured product, nearly twice as great as that of the Eastern and Middle States named.

The Eastern and Middle States show percentages of loss in value of farm lands and improvements amounting to 10.06 per cent., and of farm products amounting to 9.30 per cent., while the Southern States increased in value of farm lands and improvements 40.68 per cent., and in farm products 17.23 per cent.

The total acreage in the Southern States named is 500,000,000, the amount in cultivation is 100,000,000. Three-fourths of the uncultivated land is suited for farm purposes. The gross product from agriculture in the South for 1890 was 24.1 per cent. on the value of investment. In the other States of the Union it was 13.1 per cent. What an opportunity this section offers to home-seekers! They will find land cheap, and the people ready to receive them with hospitality. Political affiliations no longer affect social relations in the South.

The land is most varied in its uses. The lofty elevation of the Piedmont region furnishes a climate similar to New England, while the low lands of the Gulf States are suited to semi-tropical products. Between these two can be found every character of soil, and the farmer can choose the locality and raise what he pleases. Locations can be found in which wheat, corn, cotton, and fruit can be successfully cultivated in the same field. The truck farms furnish great results, and from Norfolk alone is shipped annually over $6,000,000 worth of vegetables and fruits. While the South produces over 60 per cent. of the world's cotton, its grain crops are now nearly equal to its cotton crops.

It was claimed that, in 1865, the cotton industry must go

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with slavery, yet the cotton crop of 1892 was about twice that of 1860.

The Philadelphia *Times* has said:

"The fact that the Southern States have made such a remarkably good showing since the financial pressure commenced has begun to attract the attention of investors from the North and West. A good deal of capital has already been placed by shrewd operators like Gould, Vanderbilt, Corbin, and others in Alabama, Texas, Virginia, North Carolina, and other Southern States, and many colonies of intelligent wage-earners have been planted in localities where it is believed beneficent emolument will follow."

The standing timber of the South is equal in value to that of the balance of the Union, and the annual output of the saw and planing mills grew in the period from 1880 to 1892 from $38,000,000 to $117,000,000.

The iron ore is without limit, and a statement of the comparative cost in the Southern district and the Northern district, prepared by Hon. Carroll D. Wright in 1891, shows an advantage of $3 per ton in favor of the South. The increase in the production of iron by this section since 1880 has been 500 per cent.

The coalfields of the Southern States cover over 60,000 miles, which, as Mr. George W. Armstead states in *The Tradesman*, is seven times as much as in Great Britain, and more than in Russia, Great Britain, Germany, France, and Belgium combined. The coke is excellently adapted to use in manufactures. Since 1880 the production of coal has increased from 3,000,000 of bushels to 25,000,000 bushels.

But the manufacture of cotton in the South offers the most inviting field for industrial growth. The South produces over 60 per cent. of the cotton of the world. Only about one third of our cotton is manufactured in the United States. The balance goes to Europe, where its value is increased threefold, creating thereby $600,000,000 each year which properly belongs to this country.

Every advantage is offered for the manufacture where the cotton grows. The climate permits uninterrupted operation for factories, every month of the year. The raw material is at hand with cheap coal for steam, or ample water power to be obtained at reasonable prices. Labor can live with less expense than in New or old England. While no discontent exists among the laboring classes in the South, still a large portion of the service required in cotton factories can be there obtained at a low figure. If England is to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continue our chief competitor in the manufacture of cotton goods, surely much negro labor can be found in the South to compete with English white labor in the cotton mills.

Perhaps the negro is intended as the laborer to manufacture cotton as well as to hoe it. There are reasons to believe that eventually the yellow race of the East will prove a formidable competitor in this line of business. If so, it may be necessary to overcome them by the use of the black labor in the South. It is certainly true that all indications point to the manufacture in the South of the cotton there grown. It would change the value of the crop annually from $300,000,000 to about $1,000,000.000.

The manufacture of cotton has increased in the South since 1880 from 342,048 to 2,171,147 spindles, and the value of the annual product from $16,350,000 to $54,200,000.

The remarkable experience of the Southern mills during 1893, scarcely any of them quitting work, and nearly all of them paying good dividends, furnishes conclusive evidence that the South is the best locality for the business.

Mr. Richard H. Edmunds in the *Manufacturers' Record* has well said:

> "The lumber business has enriched a large part of the Northwest; cotton manufacturing has added hundreds of millions to the wealth of New England; coal and iron is the basis of most of Pennsylvania's enormous industrial activity. The South combines these four—lumber, cotton, iron, and coal. They can be utilized at a lower cost than in any other section, and they will add to the South the fourfold wealth that they have created elsewhere."

Judge Kelley may not have been right when he said, "The South is the coming El Dorado of American adventure," but he dealt with simple truth when saying, "It is a country upon which the Almighty has with most lavish hand bestowed his richest material gifts."

HOKE SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEA POWER OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY CHARLES H. CRAMP.

THE discussion of the elements and effects of sea power evoked by Captain Mahan's books has been fruitful of suggestion as to the aggregate of navies and the political consequences of superiority at sea, but little has been said of the individuality of ships. This, of course, is from the point of view of the statesman and the diplomatist, but the share which the designer and builder of ships has in the production of sea power remains to be examined.

Primarily it is worth while to remark that Captain Mahan's theme is by no means new, the real merit of his books resting in the fact that he has given a new force to old and well-known facts. Long ago the wisdom and foresight of Englishmen discerned the value of sea power before they possessed it, and Lord Bacon made it the subject of an essay as luminous as it was prophetic. This essay occurs in his work on the "True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates," and the following pithy extract serves to exhibit the train of thought:

> "To be master of the sea is an abridgement of a monarchy. We see the great effects of battles by sea; the Battle of Actium decided the Empire of the World; the Battle of Lepanto arrested the greatness of the Turk. There be many examples where sea fights have been final to the War. . . . This much is certain, that he who commands the sea is at great liberty and may take as much or as little of the war as he will, whereas those that be strongest by land are many times nevertheless in great straits. Surely at this day with us of Europe the vantage of strength at sea (which is one of the doweries of this Kingdom of Great Britain) is great, because most of the kingdoms of Europe are not merely inland, but girt with the sea most part of their compass, and because the wealth of both Indies seems in great part but an accessory to the command of the Seas."

The phrase here is indeed Baconian, but the thought is as fresh now as it was then, and in the concluding sentence one may find

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a prophecy of the British conquest of India, and the necessity of keeping open the sea road. Captain Mahan's work, however, loses none of its merit from the fact that Bacon "blazed the way" for him; on the contrary he is rather to be congratulated on having so distinguished a predecessor.

Leaving the diplomatists and the strategists to pursue their generalizations, I will try to point out the office of the naval architect and builder in the creation and maintenance of sea power.

In a recent interview published in a British journal, Captain Mahan with much pith and force described the basis of maritime supremacy by saying that the battleship is to fleets what infantry is to an army; but when pressed by the reporter to particularize the type which he considered most effective, the captain declined to offer an opinion. This abstention was creditable both to his sound judgment and good taste. There are many types of battleships, each one with ardent partisans, and had Captain Mahan expressed a predilection for one type it would have been taken as a challenge by the adherents of all the others. This exhibits good judgment; while on the point of good taste he is quite properly content to leave questions of design and construction to naval architects and builders.

There are some considerations affecting type and size of battleships which are of general interest and sufficiently non-technical to be easily comprehended by the average reader. I shall confine my observations to this class of subjects, because the purely technical questions involved in planning and constructing ships could be made neither interesting nor instructive to the readers of a popular magazine.

Necessarily in conformity to prevailing ideas and practice the employment of battleships for the enforcement of sea power involves their operation in fleets or squadrons. The experience of war may and probably will modify prevailing ideas and set a limit to the number of battleships that can be safely or effectively manœuvred in squadron. It is more than probable that at a very early stage of action the commanding officer of a modern battleship will find it necessary to signal for every captain to do the best he can. Possibly fleet or squadron tactics as now received and understood will be found to impede or even destroy the efficiency of modern battleships.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No action having occurred between fleets of modern battleships, the tactical conditions must be somewhat conjectural or at least theoretical; but the experience of peace drills and manœuvres has demonstrated that the elements of difficulty and danger due to modern appliances as compared with the conditions of the great sea-fights of history have been multiplied many fold. For example, at Trafalgar the "Victory," "Teméraire," and "Redoubtable" were foul of each other for a considerable period, and some historians say that the "Bucentaure," Admiral Villeneuve's flagship, was also foul of the bunch at one time. None of these ships of the line sustained any injury worth mentioning from the fouling alone.

I presume no one imagines that three or four modern battleships could be foul of each other for many minutes before some of them would begin to sink from the effects of contact alone, and irrespective of any execution done by their batteries or torpedoes. This ever present danger is equally great from friend and from foe, and the fact that it must be vastly increased by the circumstances of action will devolve upon the commander of the fleet and upon each one of his captains responsibilities which Rodney and Nelson and their captains never dreamed of.

These facts suggest a wide range of problems embracing not only tactics, which is outside of my province, but design, structure, manœuvring appliances—in short, everything that pertains to handiness, controllability under various conditions, and ultimate safety after a maximum of injury. The fate of the "Victoria" demonstrated that subdivision into water-tight compartments is useless if communication between any number of them is left free, and that water-tight doors, at least as arranged in that ship, cannot be closed against much head of in-rushing water. It also demonstrated the fact that the tactical diameters of ships, as ascertained by trial singly in smooth water, and under the most favorable conditions, cannot be depended on in fleet manœuvres at sea.

Above all it demonstrated that captains differ in capacity and in promptness, and that such difference operating in the brief time allotted to a single manœuvre may easily be fatal to a ship or, in action, to a fleet. This is a case of the personal equation; the operation of the human factor, which is always unequal to an immeasurable degree if we consider the possible extremes of capacity and incapacity—but at best always subject to error, and hence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

calculated to defeat or mar in greater or less degree the efficiency of the most skilfully designed and most perfectly constructed mechanical devices. This is a fundamental fact, having its origin in the organic weaknesses of human nature, and hence unavoidable. At best its consequences can only be mitigated.

Last November in a paper read before the American Society of Naval Architects, discussing the practicable size of ships, I used the following language :

> "There is another limitation to practicable size which has not been mentioned—the ship may become too large for the captain. It is the fact that while we may increase the dimensions of ships the size of man is a fixed quantity. I mean this in the physical as well as the mental sense. A ship is not like an army which can be divided in sections, each capable of independent action. She must be commanded and manœuvred in one piece and by one man.
>
> "I have during many years of observation and experience in my profession seen so much of the human factor under such circumstances (circumstances placing the lives of so many men in a ship at the mercy of one man), that the elimination of it in every possible direction has become almost a passion with me. In any ship design it is the first principle with me to provide as many absolute and unchangeable qualities of performance and safety as possible and to place them beyond manipulation."

For the reasons that I have already stated these observations originally made with reference to trans-Atlantic passenger vessels apply with ten-fold force to battleships. As the speed of any fleet is that of its slowest ship, so will its manœuvring power be limited by the capacity of its poorest captain. As it might easily happen that the slowest or least handy ship and the poorest captain would be joined, the quality of the other ships and the ability of the other officers would go for nothing.

In view of the complex character of the ships themselves and the difficulty and danger of manœuvring them under the most favorable conditions, as pointed out, the experience of the first general action will demonstrate the necessity of having all the battleships in a fleet as nearly alike as possible in size, type, and capacity of performance. Such provision would not equalize the personal factor of different commanding officers, but it would at least give them all an equal chance at the start. For this reason I have always considered it unwise to multiply types or to seriously modify those which the best judgment we are now able to form approves. The practice of the English, French, Russians, and Germans has been contrary to this idea.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Each new administration of their navies has brought in new types, until their navy lists present an almost bewildering variety. For example the present Mediterranean fleet of England includes ten battleships, comprising six different types, and ranging in speed from the old "Dreadnaught" of 12 knots to the "Hood" of 16½. Of these six types four are singly represented, namely: the "Dreadnaught," old-fashioned double-turreted monitor; the "Sanspareil," sister-ship to the late "Victoria"; the "Ramillies," modern barbette battleship, and the "Hood" modern double-turret battle-ship. Another type has two representatives, the "Nile" and "Trafalgar," double-turret battleships, 2,000 tons smaller than the "Hood"; while the sixth type has four representatives, the "Anson," "Camperdown," "Collingwood," and "Howe," barbette battleships, of the Admiral class, from 3,500 to 4,500 tons smaller than the "Ramillies." The testimony in the "Victoria" Court of Inquiry showed not only the difference in the capacity of captains already referred to, but also considerable difference between the several types of ships themselves as to handiness, even at a manœuvring speed of eight knots, which was dictated by the easy natural draught speed of the slowest ship, the "Dreadnaught." It is not easy to imagine what the consequences of such discrepancy in the ability and promptness of officers or in the power and handiness of the different ships would be under the vastly altered conditions of action. Of course the English have been accumulating different types during many years of active construction under different and disagreeing admiralties, and having the ships on hand must use them, no matter how motley the resulting fleet.

These observations bring us to a survey of the comparative situation of the United States in this respect. Our navy has not accumulated an assortment of battleship types, and hence is free to pursue the desirable policy of uniformity. Our very first attempt at battleship design produced a type which I consider the fairest compromise of all divergent qualities and necessities yet reached anywhere. The resulting ship carries on a displacement of 10,400 tons armor and armament superior to British ships of 14,150 tons, is equal to them in manœuvring speed, and much quicker and handier under helm.

Our second effort produced a ship which is in some respects a modification of the first. The changes are mainly in the direc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of greater free-board and a knot more of speed, involving 1,000 tons more displacement, by which the all-around sea-going efficiency is expected to be increased; but as a fighting ship pure and simple I think no one contends that the "Iowa" is an improvement upon the "Indiana" class. Without going into detail of the differences between the two ships, I will say generally that the "Indiana" class is able to combat any first-rate battleship afloat as to armor and armament; she has as much speed as will ever be needed for manœuvring purposes, and her coal capacity is sufficient for any cruise that the policy of the United States will ever require in war.

When to these offensive and defensive qualities is added the fact that the "Indiana" developed on her preliminary trial a readiness of response and fidelity of direction under helm little short of marvellous in view of her dimensions and weight, she becomes by great odds the handiest first-rate battleship afloat. In the language of her navigating officer on that occasion, "she steered like a pilot boat." I submit that it does not require the training of a naval tactician to see that a fleet of ten "Indianas," compact, handy ships, alike in all leading qualities, would have the ten diverse and unequal battleships of the British Mediterranean fleet at an initial disadvantage of tremendous effect, and this without taking account of individual superiority.

These considerations seem conclusive against multiplication of types and in favor of adhering to one which so plainly meets the requirements of our national situation and policy.

The composition of a battleship fleet under such conditions would minimize the tactical dangers and difficulties referred to earlier, but these would still remain very great, and nothing can mitigate them except frequent and arduous drill in squadron of evolution, so that our captains may become familiar with their weapons before being called upon to use them in actual battle. There will be scant opportunity to drill a battleship squadron after the outbreak of war. From this point of view it is to be regretted that Secretary Tracy's programme of 1890, contemplating eight battleships, was cut down to three, and sound policy dictates its early revival.

Passing now to another branch of the subject, I think it a matter of regret that some of the most distinguished advocates of the battleship policy have deemed it a part of the argument to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depreciate the value of cruisers and commerce destroyers as an element of sea power. Captain Mahan does this by inference, rather than expressly; but the Secretary of the Navy in his admirable report for 1893 (pp. 37, 38), pointedly questions the military value of unarmored vessels. He says:

"The military value of a commerce-destroying fleet is easily overrated. Cruisers directed against an enemy's wealth afloat are capable of doing great damage; . . . but unsupported by ships of the line their operations are never decisive of a war. During the twenty years from 1792 to 1812 French cruisers and privateers captured many thousands of British vessels and cargoes, but these captures operated more to provoke a spirit of determined hostility among the British people than to create such distress or alarm as would put an end to hostilities. English line-of-battle ships instead of scattering to convoy merchant vessels, hunted and destroyed the French vessels of war at the Nile, at Cape St. Vincent, and Trafalgar. In the mean time, in spite of her losses of merchant ships and their cargoes, England continued to grow rich by her commerce. . . .

"Our own Civil War furnishes a more recent and familiar proof of my statement. The cruises of the Alabama and her sister-ships were uncommonly successful. Semmes rivalled the exploits of Jean Bar and Du Guay-Trouin. His success delighted the Confederates, but it did not benefit their cause. . . . In the mean time in spite of depredations American commerce flourished. Commerce destroying was irritating, but it accomplished nothing. It would have been ineffectual even if the Confederates had possessed ten times as many cruisers, unsupported as they were by line-of-battle-ships."

Secretary Herbert's argument of facts here is ingeniously deployed, but his point of view seems limited to the special conditions which he has in mind. In both cases he cites—England's contest with Napoleon, and our Civil War—the struggle was for life. Napoleon's success as he had planned it would have relegated England to the status of Denmark or Holland; while the consequences that would have attended the success of the Confederacy cannot be measured. In the one case it was England or nothing, in the other case the Union or nothing. In either case the superior naval power could afford to let its commerce go by the board if necessary in order to employ its fleets in strategic operations bearing directly upon the fortunes of the struggle. It is true that French cruisers and privateers captured many English merchant ships and cargoes. But in turn the English cruisers captured so many French ships of their class that by the end of the Napoleonic era a great many, perhaps a majority, of the British frigates in commission were of French build, or new ships rebuilt on captured French models; so there was some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compensation, and as for French commerce the English cruisers simply swept the sea clean of it. Nor am I prepared to agree with Secretary Herbert's light estimate of the effects produced by the "Alabama" and her consorts. It is true that they did not decide the struggle, but they made it infinitely more difficult, costly, and painful. If they did not materially benefit the Confederacy they did help England to an amazing extent. Coming just as they did, at a turning point where new materials of construction and new devices were becoming factors in the contest for commercial supremacy, the Confederate cruisers cleared the seas of our old merchant marine, and, before we could recover from the blow, England had occupied the ground.

In view of this far-reaching result, the operations of the Confederate cruisers cannot be fairly estimated on the basis of their immediate devastations. The Geneva Tribunal awarded $15,500,000 in settlement of the direct damage they did to the United States aided and abetted by England. The question of consequential damage, which far surpassed the other in importance, was ruled out of court. We got the mess of pottage; England got the birthright. That has been the case with every treaty we have negotiated with England except the treaty of Independence.

Viewed in the light of these notorious historical facts, it is clear that no theory can be sound that leaves the Confederate cruisers out of the category of sea power. The fact that their operations inured to the benefit of England rather than of the Confederacy was not accidental. On the contrary it was with deliberate purpose to that end that they were built in English yards, armed with English cannon, coaled with English coal, and manned by English seamen. The Confederate flag that they flew, so far as it pretended to represent the practical object of their existence, was a fraud. Their destruction of our commerce may not have helped the Confederate cause, but it operated beyond measure to promote England's dominion of the sea.

It is worth while to pursue this survey of the value of cruisers as an element of sea power by recalling briefly some incidents of a gratifying period in our own naval history.

In 1812 we had three frigates of forty-four guns, three of thirty-six guns, and two of thirty-two guns, together with nine sloops and brigs ranging from the "Hornet" of eighteen guns

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the "Enterprise" of twelve. There was no ship of the line. Yet this little fleet took the offensive in the face of England's sea power at its zenith, and, aided by a swarm of privateers, not only ravaged her commerce, but shocked the British sense as it had never been shocked before by repeated victories in duels between cruisers of equal rate. Commodore Porter did what all the cruisers of France had not been able to do, when he destroyed the British whale fishery in the Pacific. He lost his ship in battle against a superior force, it is true, but not until no more British whaleships were left for him to destroy. Johnston Blakeley, in the "New Wasp" of eighteen guns, cruised right in the chops of the Channel, often in sight of the English shore, and sunk two British men-of-war of his own class, besides destroying many merchantmen and sending at least one valuable prize home. Warrington in the "Peacock," and Biddle in the "Hornet," eighteen-gun sloops, made similar cruises in the East Indies and off the African coast.

I do not think there can be any question that the operations of our cruisers in that war materially aided to prepare the British public mind for the peace of 1815. Apart, however, from these historical facts there is an element in the peculiar political and geographical situation of the United States which imparts to the terms sea power a meaning different from that contemplated by any other nation. England employs sea power to keep open the roads of her colossal commerce, to maintain touch with her outlying possessions and dependencies and to enforce her status as a first-rate power in the European system, which her army alone could not do. France and Russia desire sea power as a counterbalance to England and in furtherance of ulterior designs which await only opportunity or pretext for development. There are signs which indicate that this pretext or opportunity may not be long deferred.

In no such probable or possible complications can the United States be involved. If she ever fights again it will be to assert the dignity of her flag, to vindicate existing rights against aggression, or to enforce the principles of international law. From this point of view but two nations can be our foes within any reasonable range of probability. These are Spain and England. In a war with Spain our strategy would necessarily be offensive, with territorial operations confined to the West Indies and our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cruising fleet directed against the commerce of the Philippines. In a war with England our battleships would be required for coast defence, and to break blockades, while our cruisers would find employment on every sea within their radius of action. There can never be invasion of the United States on any scale sufficient to make our territory the theatre of considerable military operations. An enterprising enemy possessed of commanding sea power would confine his activity to forays upon unprotected seaboard towns and communities, and to blockades of our more important commercial ports. Hence except for manning shore batteries or in repelling descents upon the coast our army, regular and volunteer, would be without occupation so far as defence is concerned. The bulk of the responsibility, and with it the laurels of success, would fall to the share of the navy.

This fact is well understood by our possible enemies. Hence their attitude toward the United States and their bearing in any controversy with us will be exactly regulated by our capacity for naval defence and reprisal. The meaning of sea power to the United States, therefore, is mainly of deterrent significance. That is to say, the possession of a fairly powerful and quickly mobile naval force by the United States, so constituted that part of it would be instantly available for vigorous defence against the attacks of hostile battleships, and the other part for swift and summary reprisals upon the enemy's commerce, would materially affect the tenor of diplomacy and avert war. On the contrary the absence or insufficiency of such equipment would invite war.

The view which the British Admiralty takes of the value of cruisers and commerce-destroyers as elements of sea power is strikingly embodied in their latest designs of that class, the "Powerful" and "Terrible." These are to be cruising ships pure and simple, lightly armed and wholly unarmored, and yet they are of 14,200 tons displacement, which is a trifle larger than the "Royal Sovereign" type of battleship. They are intended to be "destroyers of commerce-destroyers," and the logic of their existence is simply that of an answer to the "Columbia" and "Minneapolis." They would, of course, prey upon the commerce of an enemy, but that object in their design is rather incidental. Their primary mission will be to protect the British merchant marine by hunting down and destroying hostile cruisers at sea to prey upon commerce. Doubtless two more "Columbias" on our side would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be answered by another pair of "Powerfuls." If asked to offer an opinion as to the "Powerful" class, I should probably say that they seem overgrown. Their designed speed will not enable them to catch the "Minneapolis," while their first cost and cruising expense must be considerably greater.

With all due respect to the judgment of Secretary Herbert, who during his legislative career had more to do with the authorization and financial provision for the new navy than any other one statesman of the period, I emphatically dissent from his views as to the value of unarmored cruisers in the sum-total of sea power; and such dissent, as I have tried to show, has much broader foundation in logic for the United States than for any other nation. When I speak of cruisers in this sense I mean commerce destroyers proper, of the "Columbia" and "Minneapolis" class, and armored vessels of high speed and great endurance, like the "New York" and "Brooklyn," which, though not quite as fast as the "Columbia" and "Minneapolis," have speed and endurance enough to overhaul any commercial ship afloat, except a very few of the latest trans-Atlantic greyhounds. And I would by all means include in a subordinate but still important capacity the "Baltimore" class.

As for vessels ranging from the gunboat classes up, excepting the class of the "Baltimore," possibly we have enough of them. When the "Raleigh" and "Cincinnati" and the new gunboats are finished, and the "Chicago" is provided with modern engines, the navy will have one cruiser of 5,500 tons, six of from 4,000 to 4,500 tons, four of about 3,000 tons, three of 2,000 tons, three gunboats of 1,700 tons, and six of from 870 to 1,200 tons, available for general sea police duty. All the old ships will have disappeared three years from now, so that the main burden of peace cruising or sea police duty will fall upon the 23 vessels I have enumerated. It will probably be the policy of future administrations to keep most of the larger cruisers, both armored and unarmored, in readiness for service, rather than actively employed in ordinary times, and the same will be true of our battleships except as they may be from time to time engaged in squadrons of drill and evolution.

Events of the past three or four years have kept our available force of smaller cruisers and gunboats busy in all parts of the world, and it is a question whether the 23 vessels of the classes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

referred to can do the work of the future with sufficient margin for necessary overhaul and repair, because it is well known that ships, like men, run down rapidly with overwork. Be that as it may, I will not contend that the cruisers and gunboats of the smaller classes constitute a very important element of sea power for war purposes or as a deterrent force. But I maintain that the larger protected cruisers of the "Baltimore" class, the commerce destroyers proper, and the armored cruisers do constitute such an element of the first importance, and that sound national policy dictates a considerable increase in their number concurrently with the development of an effective fleet of battleships.

Returning to Captain Mahan, it seems but just to say that the chief value of his books—as, indeed, it was apparently his principal object in writing them—lies in the stimulus they have given to universal public opinion as to the absolute necessity of adequate naval strength to every maritime power which aspires to commercial rank and profit. He has demonstrated with the force of a syllogism that one cannot exist without the other. This is a great public service, and though his theme was of necessity mainly based upon European history, Captain Mahan's deductions and conclusions are none the less valuable as a guide to the naval policy of the United States.

Opinions naturally differ as to what the details of that policy should be so far as the programme of construction is concerned, but men qualified to judge are practically unanimous in the conclusion that we should proceed much further before calling a halt. There is also a consensus of opinion that in the "Indiana" class we have struck the type of battleship, in the "New York" or "Brooklyn" the type of armored cruiser, and in the "Columbia" and "Minneapolis" the type of commerce destroyer respectively best suited to our national needs.

Question as to the advisability of multiplying purely harbor defence ships of the "Monitor" or "Monterey" types, or of building a considerable fleet of torpedo boats and torpedo cruisers, though important, are subordinate to the topic of battleships, armored cruisers, and commerce destroyers. That the number of all three of these latter types should be increased hardly requires argument. For my own part I have not advised and would not advise the adoption of a fixed shipbuilding programme calculated to cover future operations for any considerable period. But I would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and do advise adherence within conservative limits to types which have not only proved satisfactory to our own naval authorities on trial or in service, but which have repeatedly been pronounced by the most competent foreign judges who have personally examined them to be superior to anything of similar class abroad.

We have made great and rapid progress during eight years of naval reconstruction, but we have not yet rebuilt our navy. In fact about all we can reasonably say is that we have conclusively demonstrated our domestic capacity to rebuild it.

This grand and growing development of the shipbuilding art, with the enormous impetus it has given to cognate and contributory industries in every part of the realm of usefulness, is the contribution of the naval architect and the marine engineer to the sea power of the United States.

To the brave men who make up the *personnel* of our navy may safely be left the task of using whenever duty calls the tremendous weapons we have made for them to enforce that sea power.

CHARLES H. CRAMP.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CIVIL WARS IN SOUTH AMERICA.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE ARGENTINE MINISTER AT WASHINGTON, ESTANISLAO S. ZEBALLOS.

THE prominent men of South America are always eager to know more about the United States, to study the development of its civilization, which has unfolded so rapidly and assumed such extraordinary proportions, and they have always been anxious to assist in its constitutional growth. Much of this has been the necessary sequence of their political education, and the interest felt has naturally been greatest in those republics where the federal system of government has been adopted, a method created by American constituencies. The experience gained and questions solved by the United States; the words of wisdom which have fallen from the lips of its great statesmen, such as Hamilton, Madison, and Jay; the profound learning evinced by such jurists as Marshall, Story, and Cooley; the discourses of Clay and Webster, and the messages and speeches of its great Presidents, became the fountains of political knowledge at which the South American nations drank deeply; this knowledge they had to analyze; and its results, for want of traditions of their own, they followed in the building of their own free institutions.

When a South American lands at the port of New York or San Francisco for the first time, he comes with his mind filled with pleasing illusions, like a man who approaches a dear old homestead, around the hearthstone of which his ancestors gathered. He feels that there really exists a strong political and social tie between this great Republic and those of Spanish America, amounting to a sort of political relationship. The Congresses and Pan-American gatherings during the past ten years have also contributed in a great degree to strengthen this sentiment and the natural impressions of such a traveller. From the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very beginning of his residence in this country he in fact tastes the pleasure and enjoys the pleasing impressions which a cordial welcome by the press and a warm social reception unite in producing. It is this feeling, arising from the spontaneous hospitality and frankness shown toward strangers and the social facilities extended to distinguished persons in the United States, which is such a delightful peculiarity of the national character, that carries away the European and enchants the Spanish American.

It may, however, be remarked that these demonstrations grow more out of a desire to get nearer to the Spanish-American peoples and to know them better than out of any just appreciation of their economic, political, or social conditions. It is always a source of great surprise to the traveller in the United States to find that the other nations of the New World are not so well known there as they are in Europe. The press is somewhat better informed than the community at large, but the exigencies of modern journalism are such that whatever it may publish daily is necessarily of the briefest and most cursory nature, being confined to occasional accounts of sensational and extraordinary occurrences. The social and political circles are not so well acquainted with their neighbors. Some of these groups scarcely know the very names of a few of the Spanish-American countries, and their ideas about them are as vague and confused as if they concerned regions hardly yet settled or even explored, hidden in the depths of trackless forests or beyond distant seas.

I have experienced these impressions. Now and then I have met in this country ladies and gentlemen who could discuss the Argentine Republic with the same well-informed exactness with which they spoke of affairs in the States of New York or Illinois; but these are rather cases indicating unusual curiosity on the part of individuals. My country is certainly not one of the least interesting upon the immense Southern Continent, and yet the greater part of my good friends in the United States have honored me with numberless inquiries about its political and physical geography and concerning its habits and customs. Sometimes articles have appeared in reviews and magazines, and even books have been published, with some pretence of furnishing new and correct information, but they have generally been so filled with mistakes and such a jumble of the real facts as to do injustice to these republics in South America. All this shows the meagre results that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have thus far been accomplished in the political, social, or literary circles of this country by the various Pan-American congresses that have been held, the numerous celebrations and reciprocal official courtesies exchanged, as well as by the work of the "Bureau of the American Republics." But such results have been attained in other circles and sometimes of the most satisfactory character. The merchants have eagerly seized the offered advantages, and their commercial intercourse with the countries of the New World has increased from month to month to much mutual profit.

The reasons for this lack of information in these political, social, and literary circles, concerning the sister countries of the three Americas having a Latin origin, appear to me to spring largely from three facts. One of these is the deficient teaching of Spanish-American geography in the schools of this country.

In the Argentine Republic, a child coming from a graded school can give a clear and full idea, not only of the United States as a nation, but also of its various States. There is probably not a similar American school where the like would be found to exist in reference to the Latin Republics. Still the fact that, in comparison with the Northern Colossus of the present epoch, they are but small nations, does not diminish the interest that should be felt in studying them; and this sentiment should be greater among the people of the United States because they are vitally interested in opening for the products of their industries the rich markets, capable of an enormous consumption, which the commerce of Europe has hitherto monopolized and spent so much to retain.

The second reason that occurs to me is the lack of good, rapid, and cheap means of communication, so that the thousands of American travelers are not attracted southward, but, eager for instruction and diversion, rush to the numerous resorts in the central and western regions of their own country, and swarm across the Atlantic to the Old World in increasing numbers yearly. The very few, however, who have visited these southern lands have come back enchanted with their experiences.

The third reason may be laid at the door of these very Spanish-American countries, for they have scarcely done anything to make themselves better known, and the result is that even to this time it is almost impossible to find in the English language any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sensible general information about them, except possibly some monotonous and humdrum literature, not always complete or likely to induce immigration. No matter therefore how eagerly the information might be sought, there has been very little wherewith to satisfy the craving. My experience in this special matter has been a very trying one and very complete in its way, for the Legation under my charge has been daily besought by intelligent inquiries for interesting information regarding the literature, science, and social economics of the Argentine Republic, as well as the more commonplace data for mere business purposes.

The approach to each other of the different sections of the New World proceeds but slowly. The Spanish-American countries have no marine, nor have they sufficient capital to cultivate more intimate relations with foreign peoples. In the United States the shipping interests have been allowed to decay, while capital and energy have been concentrated upon domestic enterprises and internal improvements, leaving the business enterprises of Europe and its commercial marine to almost entirely control the fertile fields of Spanish-America. This singular insulation has seemed to me worthy of special notice on my part at this time; it is a condition of things that will soon disappear when all the countries of the New World, having easy and frequent communication, will be bound by neighborly ties; because when understood it will dispel the mistaken ideas concerning South American revolutions which are held in the United States, and correct the sentiments of compassion, not unfrequently mingled with contempt, with which the citizens of this republic regard those countries most agitated by domestic disturbances.

The civil wars which have occurred in South America cannot be understood in the United States, nor the causes leading to them be explained, except by an intimate acquaintance with the social structure and conditions of each particular country. Nor is the surprise unnatural which is occasioned here by the prolonged condition of anarchy resulting from some of those internecine struggles, but it is explained by the forgetfulness of the organic conditions under which those republics were formed. These revolutions are not the work of one man, although they always follow a personal leadership. The despots and the revolutionists are equally the product of an organic internal condition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The States of the American Union were founded by enlightened people, comprising among their number many religious enthusiasts and missionaries, versed in matters of government. They brought with them as the basis of their colonies a moral capacity, habits of esteem and obedience for the regulations laid down for the government of civil society, as well as the traditional regard for justice and respect for law upon which rests the civilization of England. From such seeds there sprang a like country. The United States, comparatively near to Europe, thus received from its most advanced centres the basis of its population, which exterminated the native Indian, or isolated him in the western solitudes, without any admixture of blood except in very rare instances. The Spanish-American countries, on the other hand, were founded by military men of the Middle Ages, who came from southern Europe when the feudal system was imperative, and at a time when ideas were neither clear nor well-settled concerning the civil and political principles which served for the government of all civilized lands. Besides, the soldier element, everywhere and at all times imprudent and venturesome, did not receive the support of European emigration.

The enormous distances and the barbarism of the new regions impeded the natural current of settlers which began to flow from the Old World, reducing the colonizing expeditions mainly to soldiers and camp followers. One of the most numerous of these, which started for the immense region lying below the tenth degree of south latitude on the continent of South America, did not exceed two thousand persons. These troops soon succumbed to the unaccustomed climate, perished with want and by the hands of their savage enemies, so that the early European colonies, the nuclei around which settlements and civilization gathered, were constantly decreasing in numbers.

In order to maintain the conquest and continue the spread of civilization, the Sovereigns of Spain and of Portugal initiated a new and wise policy, which had for its purpose the peaceful subjection of the indigenous element and its mixture with the colonists coming from Europe. Thus there was provided, as a basis upon which the national structures were to be erected, proceeding from these colonies, a new race of creoles in which the native element preponderated by the number of its individuals and families and even in the proportion of blood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The native traditions of either unconditional submission and obedience to the Chief, or of implacable rebellion against him in case of a revolt, were the only rules of hereditary political science which the new social communities had for their guidance. An infusion of the blood of the warrior element of European feudalism, sometimes rebellious against its king and at others patient unto death, instead of ameliorating, only accentuated the effects of the law of social heredity in Spanish America. These new social organisms had therefore as the basic principle of their political government this fatal formula:—*despotism*, that is to say, absolute submission to the chief in power, or *revolution* by those who resisted the tyranny of the despot either because they were eager to substitute something else for it or because they could no longer endure its burden.

The brutal and ignorant masses were thus divided into two parties. Both depended upon force, by habit and tradition, and the results arrived at were in truth not likely to be solutions based upon right principles, order, or justice. These ignorant and passionate masses needed to be directed, and thus there arose among them certain leaders and commanders. Like the caciques, or chieftains among the Indians, they founded their authority upon force, upon their cunning and the terror which they inspired, or else they secured adherents by their generosity and by the shelter of the weak; thus in various ways satisfying the savage or timid instincts that swayed the passions of the uncivilized hordes of which the body politic was mainly composed. The sociologic evolution, from the tragic rebellions against Pizarro in Peru down to the recent revolution in Brazil, furnishes us with materials to formulate this law —that public order in Latin America is secure in direct ratio to the progress of education among the masses, and the extent of the European immigration, which counterbalances them.

The Brazilian revolution, in fact, began some three years ago by uprisings among the "cowboys" along the Rio Grande. The "cowboys" are a headstrong and a warlike class, whose ideas of right are sometimes confused by their confidence in the arms they always carry and influenced by stout hearts constantly habituated to danger. Their enthusiastic temperaments are naturally susceptible of being inflamed by that one among their leaders who seems most inclined to respect their arrogant and selfish life, and they are disposed to rebel against laws passed at a remote capital,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when such laws molest or interfere with their freedom or caprices. They started a revolt, but in the more advanced portion of Brazil, through the central regions where San Pablo is the metropolis and where the benefits of a university have been felt, as well as along the Southern littoral having Rio de Janeiro as a focal point, and in the North, where Bahia and Pernambuco take the lead, there was no response to the movement. The revolt of the naval squadron, which carried into the ranks of the insurgents some very prominent and respectable officers and followers, was accidental and does not conflict with the principle suggested. A bitter rivalry had broken out between the naval forces and the army, and there was much passionate folly, which the Brazilian capital contemplated coldly and with some contempt, refusing to take the part of the former.

In other South American countries public order is more solidly established, and much more so than is generally believed in the United States. Of this Chile is an example. Its terrible revolution in 1891 was an abnormal and extraordinary uprising, which assumed the form of an organic question, that of a conflict between the Congress and the executive power, complicated by bitter social antagonisms of traditional character. Now all is serene, and if the government of Chile continues to pursue the policy of prudence and toleration, which has permitted many places in the Congress to be filled by those who were defeated in the field of battle, conquerors now through the ballot, the most remote fears of disturbance will disappear and Chile will be able to continue its wise and patriotic evolution, educating its masses, extending its governing class, traditionally limited, with the best elements rising from the ranks of the people, under the redemptive influence of the schools and the universities.

The periods of peace which have been enjoyed by the other South American countries have been each time of longer duration, and these intervals have permitted the growth of a conservative sentiment as well as the culture of the body of the people. If the political situation of all of these nations does not allow the exercise of that freedom which could be wished, it is because the number of competent electors is less than the number of those who are unprepared to exercise the privilege which the law of universal suffrage has bestowed upon them, and who are dragged along by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fear, by gratitude, or by the influence of money, those efficacious means of dealing with the vote and even the life of the Indian and the ignoramus. But the time has come when, even in those countries least regularly governed, those abominable tyrannies no longer exist which have been the shame of the New World.

On the other hand, it is not always that the events which transpire in Spanish America are appreciated at their real value. It constantly happens that mere police affrays or electoral disputes are described abroad as "revolutions." This word has been used and abused until it has become meaningless. In the Argentine Republic, for example, the time for revolutions has gone by. We have too much wheat and corn to plant and harvest, for revolutionists to prosper. Nevertheless, my native land has the reputation in Europe, and even here in this country, of being a republic in revolt and incapable of self-government. The statistics of its moral and material prosperity prove the contrary. From 1869 to 1893 its population had increased from 1,800,000 inhabitants to 5,120,000. The amount of European capital invested in it, principally English, French, German, and Italian, always foresighted and well informed, exceeded eight hundred and thirty-six millions of dollars, in gold. Its common public schools, established and conducted like those of Massachusetts, with many teachers from that State and from Michigan, for thirty years past, have buildings which are actually palaces, and some of them cannot be rivalled by those of any other country in the world. Eighty photographs of these schools full of scholars were exhibited recently in Washington to many distinguished people, and they were greeted with expressions of astonishment and admiration. "They are royal palaces," they said to me; and yet in them we are now educating under compulsory laws more than three hundred thousand children of both sexes, who will form part of the sovereign people of our future.

Our national revenues increased in 1893 to $124,000,000 currency, and all the contracts affecting our foreign debt of $400,000,000 were fully complied with.

Such evidences of progress and such proofs of vitality certainly do not correspond with reports that my country is ungovernable and in a condition of anarchy. We have not yet attained the height of perfection. In a country organized under the federal system there is always more or less disturbance of the moral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equilibrium, for all the States have not reached the same advancement in their political education, or do not possess the same united governing class moved by disinterested and patriotic motives. In some of our States the number of unfit electors still predominates, while in others, more advanced, the irreconcilable ambitions of the ruling and cultured classes keep them so divided that they have lost their power, and are defeated by disciplined minorities though less competent for the exercise of the power of government. These anomalies, complicated by the ardent character of the people, result in electoral campaigns of the most excited character and in party strifes which are described as "revolutions," without reason and to the great damage of the country.

It is true that the Argentine people, originally composed of warlike and heroic herders of cattle, have wasted torrents of blood in revolutions and national wars; but they are now an industrious, active, and hardworking people, providing, after the United States, the favorite field for European investments and emigration. They have a capital of 600,000 cultivated inhabitants; a rich and most advanced system of public instruction; and a policy of conciliation in the conduct of their domestic affairs and of peace by means of arbitration in international matters; they afford conclusive proofs of an assured progress. The transformation has been as complete as it has been rapid.

Such are the fruits of forty years of constant and energetic labor for the instruction of the masses. Popular education has been the safeguard of the Argentine nationality, and it is to-day the immutable basis of its independence. This teaching has permitted the reception of the honest immigrant like a brother and European capital as a benefaction, our people being unmindful of ancient racial hatreds, disregarding religious antagonisms, and without jealousies or native superstitions. Education, European immigration, and the wealth gathered by a combination of capital with the strong arms of a people upon their fertile soil, will save and vindicate the name of South America when all the States that struggle for this end, and endeavor to correct the evils of the past, shall have secured the transformation in their organic structures which is energetically being accomplished by the Argentine Republic.

ESTANISLAO S. ZEBALLOS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO PURIFY NATIONAL LEGISLATION.

BY SENATOR WILLIAM VINCENT ALLEN, OF NEBRASKA.

Is IT consistent with sound public policy that members of either House of Congress be deemed, during their terms of office, free to deal in stocks and bonds the value of which is liable to be increased as a direct consequence of Congressional legislation? I have never at any time believed that it was consistent either with good policy or good morals. The question, however, had never pressed itself specially upon my attention until the occasion of the debate in the Senate, during the extraordinary session of 1893, on the bill to repeal the silver-purchase clause of the Sherman law. The point was then raised by one of the Senators from Nevada who offered a resolution looking to the appointment of a committee to inquire whether any Senator was an owner of stock in any National bank. The purpose of the resolution manifestly was to discover whether Senators who might vote for the repeal had a direct personal interest in such repeal—an interest greater than that of the general public. This interest, it was assumed, would attach by reason of the fact that should the government cease the issuance of Treasury notes the function of supplying money to the people of the United States would, in an increasing measure, devolve on the national banks, and would be a source of greater profit accruing to them by reason of the passage of the proposed measure to repeal the silver-purchase clause.

Many Senators did not deem the resolution quite germane to the subject under consideration. Whatever opinion may be entertained with reference to that point, there can be no doubt that the general question involved is one that must sooner or later receive the serious attention either of Congress itself or of the people. During the discussion upon that resolution it was broadly asserted in the Senate that a member of either House of Congress

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had an unquestionable right—moral as well as legal—to be pecuniarily interested in stocks and bonds whose value might be dependent upon his official action. The scope of the contention may be gathered from a remark made by one of the Senators from New York. "Senators have a right," said he, "if they are fortunate enough to be able to do so, to hold stock in national banks or State banks, or in any other institutions. They have a right to be interested in matters of finance, directly or indirectly; and any vote which they may give indirectly upon this subject, namely, with reference to great public measures, will not be affected by any pecuniary interest they may have."

I confess that this language was a surprise to me. Up to that moment I had not conceived it possible that any one would be bold enough to justify the holding, by members of either House, of stocks and bonds whose value might be increased by their own votes.

In discussing the question in the Senate I took occasion to say:

"I think I am within the bounds of truth when I say there are a great many—hundreds of thousands, if not millions of people in this nation who believe that much of the legislation that comes from Congress is influenced by the personal interests of members of Congress. If they are mistaken in their belief, then it is due to the members of this body and the other House that they [the people] be fully informed and enlightened upon the subject, for a widespread suspicion is sometimes almost as detrimental in its effect upon the public as a revelation of the truth."

With a view to bringing the matter formally to the attention of the Senate at some time when it could be discussed on its merits, unaffected by particular measures, I introduced, on June 6th last, a bill of which the following is a copy:

A BILL

TO PRESERVE THE PURITY OF NATIONAL LEGISLATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this Act it shall be unlawful for any Senator or Representative of the United States, during his term of office, to own or be concerned directly or indirectly in owning, buying, or selling, or in any manner dealing in speculative stocks, the value of which may, in any manner, depend upon a vote of Congress; nor shall any such Senator or Representative, during the term of his said office, be a member of, or in any manner pecuniarily interested in, any board of trade, stock exchange, national bank, or other organization in which speculative stocks are bought or sold.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEC. 2. That any such United States Senator or Representative who shall be found guilty of violating any of the provisions of this Act shall forfeit his office, and, upon proper resolution, shall be expelled from the branch of Congress to which he belongs, and, in addition thereto, he shall be subject to indictment, prosecution, and conviction for such offence in any United States circuit court within the district in which such offence is or may be committed.

SEC. 3. That hereafter, before any such Senator or Representative in Congress is admitted to his seat therein, he shall be required, in addition to the oath now required of him by law, to take and subscribe the following oath:

"And I furthermore solemnly swear (or affirm, as the case may be) that I will not, during my term of office, buy or sell or be in any manner concerned in buying, selling, or owning any speculative stocks, or become a member of any board of trade, stock exchange, national bank, or other organization in which speculative stocks are bought or sold."

When the bill is reached in its order for debate I shall move to amend it by prescribing a penalty, in addition to expulsion, for a violation of its provisions.

Is there a necessity for the enactmont and enforcement of a law of this character? Within the limits of the present article it would be practicable barely to indicate very few of the reasons which I conceive to be controlling on this question.

The law has condensed the wisdom of the ages into the maxim "No man can be a judge in his own case." All human experience has demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that it would be putting human nature to a test altogether too severe to expect a wholly impartial exposition of law from a judge who was himself pecuniarily interested in the result of a suit tried before him. Hence in this country it has become an undeviating rule for judges not to sit in cases in which they are personally concerned. Should they do so, the rule is equally well settled that their judgments would be absolutely void and of no effect. The moment it should appear of record that the judge was pecuniarily interested in the result of a litigation tried before him, he would become *ipso facto* deprived of jurisdiction. This is upon the broad ground of public policy—upon the ground that to permit judges to act in such cases would be to encourage corrupt practices on the part of the judiciary, and would lead to gross injustice.

It is well known that the judiciary of this country is of the very highest character for probity and integrity. Yet the law, with a merciful regard for human feelings, declines to permit any judge to sit in his own case. Why should not this beneficent rule be applied to the legislative as well as the judicial branch of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Government? If, in the case of an *interpreter* of laws—and such, in the last analysis, a judge must be said to be—it is too much to expect that he will observe the strictest impartiality in a case in which he is himself pecuniarily interested, what divinity should hedge a *maker* of laws to shield him from the operation of the same principle? What disparagement of his character can be involved in a law which would have the effect of removing from him even the suspicion of wrongdoing?

Congress possesses exclusive legislative jurisdiction over all matters national in character. Whether for good or ill its laws operate with full and direct force upon all citizens within the confines of the Republic. Why should not its members, charged with such grave responsibilities, and executing for the entire nation so delicate and far-reaching a trust, be compelled to observe the same degree of propriety that the laws require to be observed by members of the judicial branch of the Government? Why should they not be required to refrain from practices that would constitute a serious offence in a judge of the most obscure local court? If it would be too much to expect that one class of public officials, and those acknowledged to be of the highest integrity and probity, can act impartially in a case in which their private pecuniary interests conflict with an impartial performance of their public duties, what good reason can be urged for exempting from the operation of the same wholesome principle another class of public servants of necessarily no higher—inasmuch as there can be no higher—degree of integrity and probity?

Doubtless some critics will say that my reasoning would lead to the exclusion of Senators and Representatives from engaging in any honorable private occupation during their terms of office, or investing in any property which, as an incident of the general prosperity induced by beneficial legislation, might be increased in value. But my language will not bear this interpretation. I seek by the proposed bill merely to restrain Senators and Representatives during their terms of office from owning, or being concerned, directly or indirectly, in owning, buying, selling, or dealing in speculative stocks, "*the value of which may in any manner depend upon a vote of Congress.*" I am sure the country demands this of them, just as a private employer would demand of one whose services he had engaged that he should refrain during his term of service from entering into any business that might con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flict with the interests of the employer intrusted to the care of the person employed. The line of demarcation is clear. In order that the prohibition may take effect, the stocks and bonds must be of a character to be directly affected by a vote of the Senator or Representative. No man of ordinary observation or experience of life could have the slightest difficulty in distinguishing such stocks and bonds from those in which investment would not be prohibited. The distinction is plain, and capable of ready enforcement. In my judgment every man who enters the public service agrees, at least impliedly, that he will not engage during his term of office in any private service, or be concerned in any private business, that might conflict with his public duty.

The topic would admit of wide expansion, but I will not pursue it. I will simply say that in my judgment the perpetuity of the Republic depends in a very large measure upon a higher patriotism, a more exalted conception of public duty, and a more rigid fidelity to the common welfare than is consistent with the theory that members of the national Legislature may be engaged in speculating in stocks and bonds whose value may be affected by their own votes.

The statement has been made, and dwelt upon with emphasis, that there is no statute making such speculation a crime or prescribing a punishment for it. That must be conceded. It is for this reason that I have proposed the bill to which I have referred. I think a grievous necessity exists for the enactment of a statute that will effectually put a stop to the pernicious practice. Should that bill, or one containing similar provisions, become a law, the offending member should not only be expelled in dishonor, but should be subject, in due form, to indictment, prosecution, and conviction, as he would be for the commission of any other crime, or as would be the case with any ordinary criminal. The higher and more delicate the duty imposed upon men, the more rigidly should they be required to refrain from doing aught that would bring into question the purity of their purposes.

Hence, to the oath which, by the Constitution, is required to be taken by a member of the national Legislature before being permitted to occupy his seat, I would add a provision by which he would swear that, during his term of office, he would not be concerned in buying, selling, or dealing in speculative stocks, or become a member of any board of trade, stock exchange, National

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bank, or other organization "*in which speculative stocks are bought or sold.*" These safeguards, rigidly enforced, and supplemented by an enlightened critical public sentiment, would accomplish a purpose which every patriot must desire to see accomplished. It would place the country upon a sounder basis of public and private morality. Some degree of political corruption will always be suspected so long as public sentiment tolerates a dabbling by members of Congress in speculative stocks. There will always be more or less newspaper criticism of the motives of legislators, and constant suggestions of the wisdom of inquisitorial investigation into the private affairs of Senators and Representatives.

I admit that an ideally perfect republic is out of the question. "Times change, and men change with them." The perfect work of to-day may, a few years hence, be demonstrated to be anything but perfect. But this is no reason why the people should not require of their public servants the same degree of fidelity to duty that private employers would require of those whom they take into their service.

Recent investigations into the method of transacting the public business have convinced me—I say it with all due respect—that a higher ideal of public service than that which at present prevails is of the utmost importance to the country. While legislation must always be in some degree imperfect, as men are imperfect, yet it should be framed by men of high ideals, inspired by such patriotism and love of country as will always subordinate the mere personal interests of the legislator to the vastly greater interests of his country.

W. V. ALLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MY CONTEMPORARIES.

SOUVENIRS OF SOME CELEBRATED PEOPLE OF THE TIMES.

BY JULES CLARETIE.

I THINK there is nothing sweeter in the world, after the joy of living with those whom one loves, than the remembrance of those whom one has loved. Age which brings many disillusions also has its consolations. It allows one to claim from the past whatever, either affecting or remarkable, it may contain.

In looking backward at those one has known in former times one lives one's life over again, but without the trouble of it, finding even in the disappointments of the past a certain melancholy not entirely without charm, just as after one has recovered from sickness one finds in convalescence something indescribably delightful. I do not in any sense mean to say by this that life is a morbid thing, for which the remedy would be repose. No, nothing so avails as the human struggle to strengthen the moral and mental forces; but after the contest, what is more charming than to recall it?

It has been my lot to know celebrated people—nearly all those who have made our times illustrious. I have either seen them in their glorious and sometimes sovereign old age, like Victor Hugo, or at their *dêbuts*, obscure and poor, but dreaming of glory and fortune, like Émile Zola. I have associated with Michelet, whose ardent words made me enthusiastic at twenty. I have, though very young then, been treated as a friend by Sainte-Beuve. I still hear the voice of Alexandre Dumas the elder, recounting to me in his boasting tones his remembrances of Naples and of his collaboration with Garibaldi. Émile Augier, to whom Paris will soon erect a statue, formed one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the affections of my young life. I recollect Alphonse Daudet at twenty years of age, handsome as a Hindoo god, but sick, so that, as he was starting for Algeria, we said, "The poor fellow, we shall see him no more!" He was then known only as the author of the delicious poem of the *Double Conversion*, and of the romance of the *Chaperon Rouge*. Since then he has become one of the masters of contemporary fiction and of the French language, and, thank God, we have seen him again, and we see him every day.

Our sons are now making their appearance, and Léon Daudet continues his father's glorious name. Recently in visiting the salon of the *Société Nationale des Beaux Arts* in the Champ de Mars, I stopped before two pictures numbered 577 and 578; one represented "*Old Vessels*," the other the armed vessel "*Devastation*." The two marine pictures are signed "G. Hugo," and "G. Hugo" is Georges Hugo, the grandson of the great poet. He had learned to work in crayon before he became a sailor. He was at sea for some years and while on board continued to paint in addition to his other labors. He is now an artist and exhibitor. Well I see it all again—he quite small and I drawing figures, soldiers, and zouaves for him during the siege of Paris, while his father, Charles, and his white-bearded grandfather, Victor Hugo, watched my pen forming figures on the paper. How time passes! Victor Hugo is dead, dead also and (before him) is my friend his son Charles. And the small child of whom the poet then sang in "*L'Art d'être Grand-père*" now handles the brush.

"Go on! Another zouave!" he would say long ago when I stopped. And Victor Hugo smiling would remark: "Obey, I admit but one tyranny; indeed I am not satisfied with admitting it, I proclaim it. It is the tyranny of children."

At that time I had a project for publishing a book—a sort of protest of liberal youth against the Empire—under the title, *Mémoire d'un Homme de Trente Ans*. I wished to bring forth in it all the grievances which with our republican aspirations we had against the Imperial *régime*. I waited till I was exactly thirty years of age to commence that book. When the time came, we had something else to think of than writing! Did we even know if we would ever write again? It was in December, 1870, and the enemy was at our gates. I put off the *Mémoire d'un Homme*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

de Trente Ans to the last moment, and then put on a soldier's cloak. To-day as I think of that projected book which will never be published, I give it a different title and form in my mind. Man spends his life in building castles in the future. As I waited in those days to be thirty before writing the first line of the *Mémoire d'un Homme de Trente Ans* (which was never penned) I am waiting to-day for the end of the present century to publish, at the earliest dawn of the twentieth century, a volume of my recollections and impressions, which I shall call *Souvenirs du Siècle dernier*. But, of course, to realize this new dream God must, as we say, lend me life. To all his plans Victor Hugo always added "*Deo volente.*" It is perhaps well, therefore, to make haste and not to defer the accomplishment of any work whatever to a date fixed by ourselves, which fate may not always permit us to reach. Do we know, indeed, whether or not we shall finish the page that we have begun?

The Memoir that I wish to preserve of celebrated men I have known—writers, politicians, painters, comedians, soldiers—will help me to compose my *Souvenirs du Siècle dernier*, when the nineteenth century shall have given place to the twentieth. Perhaps at that time the fame of many who are eminent as I write may have suffered damage. Every new generation is severe enough upon those who have preceded it, and our young people, who found a new literary or artistic school every fifteen days, willingly class their elders among the "*Invalides.*"

It seems to me that we were less anxious to scalp those who went before us. Admiration for the masters was one of the virtues of our youth. I recall that one night at the first representation of *Le Lac de Glenaston*, a weak French adaptation of one of Dion Boucicault's plays, at the Ambigu, I saw, from the top of the second gallery where I had had difficulty in securing a place, two young men enter. They took seats in the orchestra, the one smiling, lively, restless, fair, and noisy—the other already stout, quiet, and almost shy. They were Edmond About, then in full vogue, and Francisque Sarcey, who was serving, but already with brilliant success, his first campaign as dramatic critic in the *Opinion Nationale*. The sight of those two young masters in journalism put me in such a state that I listened no longer to the play. I believe that I did not miss much. I watched Edmond About; I watched Sarcey.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They were saluted by all. The actresses smiled on them. "Ah!" I thought to myself, "Shall I ever be able to follow their footsteps?"

To-day I am persuaded that not only if poor About, who is dead, but my friend Sarcey, who is strong and in good condition, entered a theatre the young people would not say to themselves, "Would that I might some day be like him!" but rather, "I wish I could wring his neck this very day!" It is progress; Sarcey knows it well, and laughs at it often.

We edited at that time a small literary paper which appeared every week, and which was called *Diogène*. This journal, satirical like all young publications, carried in front a picture of Diogenes, with a lantern in his hand, looking for a man among the great men of Paris. The great men at that time were after Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas or rather the two Dumas, Théophile Gautier, Jules Janin, Sainte-Beuve, Jules Sandeau, Arsène Houssaye, and many others; and among dramatic artists Frédéric Lemaitre, Mélingue, Samson, Regnier, Provost, Mme. Plessy, Augustine Brohan (or rather the Brohans, Augustine and Madeleine). Rachel was dead. I had seen the funeral leave the house in which she lived in the Place Royale not far from the residence of Victor Hugo, on a January morning, and I recollect the enormous head of Alexandre Dumas (*père*), like the forehead of a good giant, towering above the crowd that had gathered to take a last farewell of the *tragédienne*.

The day after the funeral, Granier de Cassagnac wrote in his journal, *Le Réveil*, "Tragedy is forever shrouded in the tragédienne's coffin." Granier de Cassagnac did not foresee Sarah Bernhardt.

We sought therefore with Diogenes' lantern for great men, and when we found them we gave them the respectful salutation of our twenty years. But we looked above all for *young* men, and I remember having seen one night at M. Paul Meurice's, in the Avenue Frochot, a thin young man, with very fair, nearly golden, hair, and with peculiar dreamy and fixed eyes, who had just published a first volume of verses. There was a little piece of his being performed at the Théâtre de l'Odéon.

"And the title of your piece is?" we asked the young poet.

"Its name is *Le Passant*."

It was Francois Coppée.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I had been struck by the resemblance of the author, soon to be celebrated, to Victorien Sardou. And I had also seen Sardou, some years before in the humble compiling office of the *Diogène* in the Passage Sauliner, to which he had come to thank us for an article that had treated of one of his first pieces, his first success, *Les Pattes de Mouche*. My first article for *Diogène* had appeared in the same number with a wretched portrait representing Victorien Sardou coming out of an egg—a thin, emaciated Sardou, the profile sharp, his long hair falling in stiff rings close to his hollow cheeks, a Sardou who resembled Bonaparte in Italy much more than Francois Coppée did Victorien Sardou.

I did not know the author of the *Pattes de Mouche* other than from this distorted picture, until one morning I saw a thin young man squeezed into a black surtout, his high well-modelled forehead surmounted by thick black hair, enter the office of our little paper. Bright eyes lit up his face, which was of an extraordinary fineness, but what struck me most about his expression was the smile, slightly ironical, though amiable, which gave his profile the aspect of that of Erasure. At that time (I speak of thirty years ago) M. Sardou had above all the Cæsarean visage of the young Conqueror of Toulon, and he had also taken Toulon, I mean to say that he had gained there his first victory and the most difficult one,—that which opens the gates of the future and decides a whole existence. He was thirty-two years old and, at once, in one night, he had thrown from him, like a too heavy cloak, all the years of that noble misery which he had conquered. I do not know of any young man engaged in the struggle for life in Paris whose career was more dignified and courageous than his had been. It ought to serve as an example to all artists who dream of fame, and who despair because she does not come to them at their first call. Before his reputation was established, or more correctly before achieving his first success, Victorien Sardou had worked strenuously, manfully, to gain before the millions of the future a commanding place. Quite young, having already written a tragedy which he destined for Rachel, *La Reine Ulfra*, and one *Bernard Palissy*, Victorien Sardou thought he had won his place when he produced a comedy in verse at the Odéon entitled *La Taverne des Étudiants*, which was outrageously hissed. It represented some German students who were drinking beer, after the fashion of German stu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dents, and the students of Paris thought that in presenting these drinking-scenes the author of the new play insulted the college youths. And how they protested! I do not know whether the piece was finished, but at all events it was brought to an end in the midst of an indescribable tumult. The poor *Taverne des Étudiants* had also very bad luck. In the middle of an important love scene, on which Victorien Sardou had counted much, the gas suddenly went out, and for fully a quarter of an hour the whole theatre was plunged, like Orestes, in profound darkness. The audience availed themselves of this opportunity to make a deafening uproar, while the unfortunate author, broken-hearted at the shipwreck of his hopes, helped behind the scenes.

But Sardou was not one of those who allow themselves to be beaten. "I have never been unsuccessful," he said to me one day, "that the failure has not rebounded and conducted me to greater success." He was cast down by that tempestuous *début*. He said he would lift himself up again. But he had to live and, as Émile de Girardin has said, the great thing in this world is to *endure*. In order to endure, that is to say exist, Victorien Sardou worked at all the honest trades that a poor scholar could find. He wrote historical studies at one sou a line for Firmin Didot's *Biographie Universelle*, every line of which cost him two or three hours of research and labor. He showed me an essay on Erasure written at that period, a marvel of rare learning. The *Biographie* of Didot contained a life of Jerôme Cardan, by him, which showed an amount of erudition which was extraordinary. It was also saturated with the spirit of the sixteenth century, which Meyerbeer's *Huguenots* and Michelet's writings have brought so conspicuously forward, and of which he later on made such a thrilling episode in his fine drama of *Patrie*. In order that he might not fall the next time he should try his work at the theatre, he divided his time between two occupations—his biographical work and his *métier* of dramatic author—and the means which he employed to learn were both simple and very heroic. When he went to the theatre he listened with passionate attention, noted the good points and the faults, and returning to his home he would reconstruct and rewrite his play entirely, labor which others would have found unnecessary, but which enabled him to acquire the touch of a master. He has besides, much later in life, utilized in his work these fragments and exercises of his youth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All this work, however, served merely to provide a bare living for him, but did nothing in the way of assuring comfort. Being married he wished to give a little luxury to his wife. Then he loved his books. He often found himself in intimate conversation with a young man, a poet, named Edmond Roche, who also dreamed of glory and who, while waiting, filled a very modest position at the Paris Custom House. Roche and Sardou exchanged their dreams and the accounts of their experiences. "Bah!" said Roche, "You will achieve your aim, you are tempered for the struggle, but I will never have the time." Nevertheless glory smiled first on Edmond Roche. Through the glass doors he saw one day coming into the little office which he occupied in the Custom House a man then very little known in Paris, who had come from Germany to seek applause from the Parisians. "Monsieur," said he to Roche, "they tell me that you speak German well and also that you know my works; I need a translator to present them to the French public. Will you collaborate with me in this translation? I am Richard Wagner." It seemed to Roche as if it was the Messiah in person who entered the Custom House. He translated *Tannhäuser*, *Lohengrin*, and the *Flying Dutchman*, and Sardou assisted in perfecting the work. After all, Roche had guessed correctly—he had not time to wait. Consumption carried him off, and Sardou wrote a preface to his posthumous poems.

Victorien Sardou himself was losing patience, and at the time that M. Montiguy, the director of the Gymnase, accepted his *Pattes de Mouche*, the future author of such famous works was pondering as to whether he should leave France for the New World. He had even made inquiries as to the next boat leaving for America, as he wished to seek his fortune in New York, when M. Montiguy wrote to him, "Come; your play is accepted."

"Also," Sardou told me, "I am a little superstitious and I have always had confidence in my star. For instance, one day when I was profoundly melancholy I stopped by a post at the side of a door, which I can still see, to allow a large wagon filled with enormous building stones to pass down a street to my right. Suddenly, without any reason, I left the place where I was and moved a short distance away. Scarcely had I quitted the post where I had been a few seconds previously when one of the large stones slipped from the wagon and crushed—yes, literally crushed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—a poor devil of a water-carrier who had stepped into the place which I had just quitted, and which I always look at in passing along that street; and I said to myself as I watched them carry the corpse to a drug store: 'It is you who ought to have died if fate had so willed. Fate protects you. It's a good sign —Forward; and courage!'"

This incident which I have told, among the many that I know of Sardou, has always struck me most forcibly. When he came to see us at the office of *Diogène* he had already emerged triumphantly from that period of dark sorrow. He had encountered on his way a good fairy in the person of the *comédienne* Virginie Déjazet, who played *Les Premières Armes de Figaro* for him, a smart and juvenile piece which revived the spirit of Beaumarchais. He was soon going to bring out *Nos Intimes*, a brilliant success at the Vaudeville Theatre then situated in the Place de la Bourse, (where afterwards I saw Charles Dickens on the night of the first representation of *L'Abûne*) and Victorien Sardou glowed under the first kisses of glory.

He fascinated me from our first interview, and he asked me to visit him in the Place de la Bourse. He gave me tickets for his next play, *Nos Intimes*; and as he had guessed me to be a bibliophile, he showed me his old books, of which some were precious, and which he had picked up at the stands on the quays for two and five sous.

I remember that first visit. Victorien Sardou lived in the corner of the Place and the Rue Notre Dame des Victoires, in a small apartment under the slated roof. In fact, it resembled a little the garret of Bonaparte, lieutenant of artillery, on the quays. Sardou worked there at a table or on a shelf; everywhere one saw books, books stitched, books in old bindings, manuscripts and heaps of papers. When he was writing, his head was always covered with a velvet cap, and on that day he was dressed in a red flannel coat like the shirts worn by the followers of Garibaldi. It was from that visit that our thirty years' friendship dated, a sentiment whose strength and depth I have experienced more especially in certain hours of trial.

Who would have said that I should one day take part, in the first theatre in France, in one of this young debutant's plays? Nothing could have led me to think that I would be the Director of the *Comédie Francaise* and I little dreamed of it. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have seen Sardou at home in the Château de Marly, which he had filled with princely rarities; I have seen him chatting in the woods, walking briskly; and we have searched for the traces of the fugitive André Chenier in the environs of his dwelling. I have seen him happy amidst his own, between his charming wife and his children, who are his life. I have seen him on the stage directing the rehearsal of his work, instilling the sacred fire into the actors, the musicians, the supernumeraries—every one. For me he has remained the ideal of life, a man better equipped for the literary battle than any I have encountered: enthusiastic above all, interested in everything, attracted by every work of art, by every question, and by every problem; knowing everything, reading everything, understanding everything. He pours forth in a discussion on literature or in the defence of the interests of the Society of Dramatic Authors, or in the directions given to the scene painter or to the architect, a wealth of entrancing eloquence. He would have made a wonderful journalist, a unique debater. And how scrupulous he is! After the suspension of his drama, *Thermidor*, he resolved to transpose the play into a novel. He was to have called the book *La Terreur*, but will this work ever see the light of day? Sardou has it in the shape of memorandums and notes, and these already make a formidable mass.

"When will you compile the book, dear friend?"

"When I have all my notes: but it will be a world of trouble to revise all that dramatic epoch."

One day Sardou would go to visit the dormitories of the *Lycée Louis le Grand* to refind there the traces of the dungeons of the terror; the next he would have the doors of what remained of Robespierre's house in the Rue St. Honore opened, and he would say to me, "You know the house is not demolished, as they say, and I found it, even to the room where Maximilian slept; I will show it to you. I've worked that all out from the plans—when shall we go and see it?"

He is now busied with the restitution of Athens, the Athens of the Renaissance, for a drama which he intends for Sarah Bernhardt. He knows the smallest turns, the stones of Acropolis, as well as he was acquainted with the subterranean passages of Byzantium, at the time when he wrote *Theodora*. When we were putting *Thermidor* on the stage it was a pleasure to see him carrying the properties one by one, like an ant in an ant-hill, now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a plate bearing a revolutionary inscription, and again with a tri-colored flag which had figured of old in the tumultuous ranks of the sections. And placards of the period, and its newspapers, and busts of Lepelletier, Saint-Fargean, or of Marat. One day he was quite pleased when I said to him: "Do you know whom I will give you to play a small role? A relation of Danton's!"

"What! A relation of Danton's?"

"Yes, my dear friend, a little niece of the Ministre de la Justice; on the 10th of August Mademoiselle Danton will come. She is a model to the painter Cain when she is not dressmaking. It will be curious enough that a relation of Danton's should figure in a drama in which you represent Robespierre's fall."

"Yes, it would be curious. Where is she, this niece of Danton's?"

The next day I had the young girl brought to the theatre, and her face, though very agreeable, had something of the tragic cast of the tribune about it.

"Yes, yes," said Sardou, "she resembles him."

But it was much more striking when I put a powdered wig, such as Danton wore, on that young head. Then, as though called by a sort of sudden summons, we thought we saw the man of the revolution, he who bears in the sight of history the burden of a dismal period, but of whom Roger Collard said that he was magnanimous. The vision was complete and that child represented to us Danton in his youth: Danton at twenty years of age, Danton before the eruption of '89 and the thunder of '92.

It was this Mlle. Danton who figured at the breakfast where Labussière told Marshal and Mlle. Leconteux how he took away the file of papers from the Comité de Salut Public. Mlle. Danton found it quite natural to play for the first time on the stage of the Comédie Française, between M. Coquelin and Mlle. Bartet. She did not play there long. *Thermidor* was suppressed on the second representation, and Mlle. Danton retired into the shade. I do not know what became of her.

Victorien Sardou amused himself with those details which pleased his artistic nature. That practical spirit that left nothing to chance as he surveyed a rehearsal was at the same time a sensitive soul whose feelings were easily touched. I remember seeing him suddenly burst into tears when I told him that Émile Augier was prostrated by a mortal illness. "Oh, poor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Augier!" The day of the death of Victor Hugo I went, as I did daily, to the little house where the poet lay in agony. As I was about to enter I met Victorien Sardou, his eyes red. "It is all over," he said to me, and he wept again for the great man who had been the admiration of his youth. But even in that emotion the dramatic author did not lose his accuracy.

"You saw him die?" I asked him.

"No, but this is how I knew it was over. I was awaiting in the little room below that in which Victor Hugo was lying. I heard nothing above me, no movement, no sound. I said to myself: This silence is that of supreme expectation! All at once above me I heard precipitous and rapid steps, the noise of chairs pushed about, giving one to imagine the excitement near the deathbed, the abrupt movements of grief. One cannot mistake such sounds, and I said to myself, 'Victor Hugo is dead!'"

This was really the dramatic author imagining, divining, seeing the scene and picturing it by a sort of special magnetism. Any man who has not the sense of movement and of life might be a superior poet or a profound philosopher; he could never express the truth on the theatre.

As Sardou was paying to M. Thiers, then President of the Republic, the customary visit of a candidate for the Academy, he astonished the historian of the Consulate and of Europe by speaking to him of the transformation of the modern theatre through the spirit which the new writers have infused into it by the correctness and wealth of details.

"I have stopped at the comedies of M. Scribe," said M. Thiers.

"Monsieur le Président, have you stopped at the furniture of the time of Louis Philippe?" replied Sardou.

"No," and he looked around him.

"Have you stopped at the classic grouping of furniture round the chimney-piece, as in the time of Madame Récamier? No! There are arm-chairs in the middle of your room, some near the fire-place, some little stools, a sort of very pretty ordered disorder, which permits of conversation springing up in all the corners, giving an animation to the room which it had not when the older arrangement of furniture gave it a classic aspect. And what variety in the draperies! That Japanese silk beside the Louis XV. table, that Chinese screen before the white Marie Antoinette chair, copied from the model of Trianon! Diversity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the aim of the modern furnisher. One does not want rigidity any more, but contrast; and our furniture, like our actions, is always significant. In that respect our comedians of to-day differ from those of the time of M. Scribe. M. Scribe put a sofa at each end of the stage and invariably a table in the centre. We put stands in all the corners, small furniture everywhere, and the table where it suits us."

M. Thiers was singularly interested with this little lecture given with all kinds of picturesque gestures.

He smiled and said to Victorien Sardou: "I understand now, my dear *confrère*, why Molière was so good an author. He had been an upholsterer."

Those words "My dear *confrère*" were in effect a promise that the statesman's vote would be given to Sardou. M. Thiers, in fact, voted for him.

In this attractive question of stage furniture it is strange enough that another theatrical manager, Alexandre Dumas (*fils*), belonged to a school totally opposed to that of Sardou. Alexandre Dumas, (*fils*) cares but little for details. In the laying out of the action of his pieces he only gives summary indications. First Act: *A Salon*; Third Act: *Same as first act.* Such were the instructions for most of his comedies. The stage-manager arranged the stage as picturesquely as he could from these vague directions.

Not that Alexandre Dumas does not indicate to his artists with perfect art the intonations which he desires, the exact expression that he wants. He knows very well what he wishes and he has it executed as he intends it should be. Nearly all dramatists, besides, *indicate* well, as they say in a theatre. Octave Feuillet read his works admirably. Edouard Pailleron is a reader, and I would say a very superior actor. He speaks with the utmost precision; he shows the exact gesture that must be made. I am absolutely of the opinion of Mr. Got, the oldest member of the staff of the *Comèdie*, who voluntarily said that "An author who reads his work indifferently makes it better understood than an actor who reads it very well. He has a more correct idea of it and its movements." The comedian acts better but does not read so well.

But if, like Sardou, like Feuillet, Alexandre Dumas reads extremely well and indicates to the performers the very intonations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they must employ, he troubles himself less than Sardou about the setting, the frame of his work. When he was producing his works at the Théâtre du Gymnase, *Le Demi-Monde, Diane de Lys, La Femme de Claude,* he brought the manuscript of his work to the director, Mr. Montiguy, and allowed the play to be rehearsed without the slightest assistance from him. It was not till the end that he came, took a seat in front of the stage, and criticised the performance from the point of view of the audience.

Montiguy was an incomparable director, it is true, after having been (strange to say) an inferior dramatic author and a mediocre comedian. These singularities are not rare in artistic life. One might say that Montiguy, the author of that melodrama *La Découverte du Quinquina,* which vastly amused Jules Janin, revolutionized and modernized theatrical scenery. It was he (the circumstance seems to have no importance, but the reform dates from it)—it was he who first got actors to lay down their hats while playing. This appears insignificant, but it is characteristic. They had always before held their hats in their hands on the stage like the marquises of Molière or Regnard, who always put their plumed caps under their arms. Montiguy came and said, "Put down your hat," and it made a regular revolution. It was the entrance of life and of truth into the realm of convention. And my friend Francisque Sarcey said: "Yes, the theatre is a convention, but a convention to which the greatest possible appearance of truth must be given to make the illusion successful."

Alexandre Dumas thinks a little more than he used to do of the staging of his plays, but, like the classics, the complications or the luxury of splendid scenery are indifferent to him. "My pieces," the author of *Demi-Monde* once said to me, "do not need to be well furnished."

He troubles himself more about what those personages say and think than about what they do. In listening to Alexandre Dumas' characters I cannot help thinking that I hear Dumas speaking himself. He loves glory, but he would have, above all, in the theatre, action, the influence which the theatre gives. It would never be he who would proclaim the theory of "Art for Art's sake." Dumas (*père*) could have taken *Scribitur ad narrandum* for his motto. Dumas (*fils*) would only say *Ad probandum.* I recollect the way in which he explained this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire to me—the desire for battle, for the sake of battle, and not for victory and its triumphs.

Do you know what would be my dream? It would be to give, without signing it and in mid-summer, when Paris is empty, and is sojourning at the sea-shore or watering places, a piece which I should have written without even thinking of the public in the fullness of my idea—let it be paradoxical or irritating. The critic would not be influenced by the author's name, the reporters would give no account in advance of the coming work. It would be as when a case is tried with closed doors and M. *X.* or M. *Y.* would freely disclose his opinion. The question of receipts would not exist. The first night would not attract those eternal loungers who go to the theatre as they do to the races, and who finish by making a sport of art. If the piece were good, it would succeed all the same before this very limited public, and in any case I should have had the joy of setting forth truths in their entirety, without being obliged to mutilate them so that they might be acceptable to the crowd. An artist's dream, easy to realize in imagination, difficult in reality! They would soon guess the name of M. *X.* or of M. *Y.* The style of Dumas *fils* is not of a sort to remain long unrecognized. When he gave, in collaboration with Armand Durantin, or rather under the pseudonym of Armand Durantin, that lively and entrancing drama, *Héloïse Paranquet*, produced at first without the name of any author appearing on the bill, Francisque Sarcey cried out on the first night, "The author of that piece is Dumas *fils* or the devil!"

And Dumas experienced a special sensation of pleasure at seeing his work, under another's name, make its way in the world. He has lately told this story in the preface to a new volume which he calls *Le Théâtre des Autres*. The habit which he has of putting a preface at the head of his works in re-editing them, has become a necessity for him. For that is a trait which he has in common with his father. He writes much and he writes quickly. If one was to publish his voluminous and interesting correspondence, one would arrive at a total of volumes which would eclipse that of the works of the author of *Trois Mousquetaires*, only Dumas (*fils*) has remarked that the public regard fertility, that virtue of strong pens, as a fault. Rapid in the execution of his works, by a rare and inherited gift, he is condemned to act

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contrary to his own nature. And to write as much as pleases him without publishing more than is wanted of him, he writes prefaces which are models of discussion, and literary recollections and letters, the compilation of which will, by and by, form a collection of rare value.

When I think that they once took him for an author who wrote with difficulty, incapable of remodeling a scene once he had finished it. I have seen him in my office remake in half an hour the *denouement* of his comedy *Francillon*, after a rehearsal which he thought doubtful. "But it is excellent," I said to him; "there is nothing to change." "No, no, I know my trade," he answered; "that might be better;" and in a few moments it was better. He wrote *Danicheff* in a few days, *Héloïse Paranquet* nearly in a few hours. "Yes, in the carriage, with a pencil, my dear friend; my fingers were tired with it; those were feats of strength that I would not do again to-day."

He would do it again if it were necessary. I was looking at him the other day. He is robust, his head held high and firmly planted on an athletic body. I even think he is perfecting a play at Marly, near his neighbor, Sardou, which the public will be admitted to pass upon, but not that rare and anonymous summer public, of which he dreams for an ideal work, but the great public, *Le Herr Omnes*, which has always hailed him with applause since the *Dame aux Camélias*.

I have drawn here in my turn only rough and rapid sketches. But these notes, if they seem curious, can serve as *portraits en vied* of those I have known and, I can say, in speaking of the men of to-day, of those whom I have loved.

JULES CLARETIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LESSON OF THE RECENT STRIKES.

BY GEN. NELSON A. MILES, U. S. A.; THE HON. WADE HAMPTON, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS; HARRY P. ROBINSON, EDITOR OF THE "RAILWAY AGE"; AND SAMUEL GOMPERS, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

GENERAL MILES:

THE present status of labor, and especially the recent strike known as the American Railway Union strike which extended through the great producing zone of the country from the Alleghanies to the Pacific Ocean, embracing the territory that yields the great staple products upon which our people generally depend, is so grave a question that it should be considered with the greatest impartiality, candor, and fairness,—outside entirely of any political, religious, or personal interests and prejudices. So far as I am concerned I believe I can sincerely say that my sympathies have been from boyhood to the present time entirely with the man who labors in any honest and honorable occupation. Reared upon a New England farm—the best life and health-giving experience a boy could possibly have—I was fully acquainted with every kind of labor required of a farmer's boy, as were my ancestors before me for more than 250 years, or from the time when western Massachusetts was the frontier of civilization. My early manhood was spent in mercantile pursuits, requiring the strictest economy as well as rigid industry. For four years I was engaged in a terrible war the result of which determined the vital question of labor and the condition of the men who labored in this country; one result of it being that in a large section of our country the man who labored was raised from the condition of a slave to that of manhood and citizenship. For twenty-five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years I have been largely engaged in what has not been inaptly described as "the war of civilization,"—protecting the laborer engaged in the construction of the great trans-continental railways, the miners' camps, the home builders, and the settlers of the Western Territories and States. I have travelled very many times back and forth across the continent, and visited every State and Territory of our country; and there is no class of laboring men who have my sympathy and earnest consideration to a greater degree than the brave men who encounter all the risks and hardships incident to their duties upon the great transportation lines of our country, exposed to the severities of the varying seasons and all the vicissitudes of their hazardous occupation.

The condition of labor is attracting the attention of the thoughtful men, not only of this, but of all other countries. During the period of some 250 years of development since the original settlement of this country, the condition of the laborer has changed entirely. Up to within the last few decades every community had to its westward a boundless territory of rich fields where the man who labored could at any time locate and establish in a few years an estate amply sufficient for his family or relations and of great and permanent value. All this is now changed. For the last few decades the tendency has been to the congregating of the people in large cities and towns; and a feeling of discontent, unrest, and disaffection has become almost universal; until the feeling between the man who labors and his employer is at present surely not satisfactory. The employer has too little confidence in his employee, too little consideration and sympathy for his condition, and too little interest in his welfare; while, on the other hand, the employee has a feeling of hostility and prejudice, in many instances amounting to almost actual hatred of his employer. To what extent this feeling has been engendered and promoted by the demagogues, the professional agitators, the men of the press, the forum, the pulpit, and the stage, we leave them to answer. The conditions of our country have been such as to create and promote great corporations, trusts, and combinations of capital; while labor, on the other hand, has kept equal pace in combinations, confederations, labor unions, and secret organizations which control thousands, if not millions, of men, extending over every section of the country. The former have been and can be all controlled by judicious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislation and plain, positive law. The principal weapons of the labor organizations have been the strike and the boycott—the strike to paralyze industries, effect the suspension of business and the increase of wages, and the boycott to prevent men who do not desire to be controlled by the labor unions from obtaining work, in many cases subjecting them to serious physical and pecuniary injury. It is a singular fact that strikes have been most violent and serious in the mining communities and among men connected with railways.

The most serious part of the question is the extent to which our seventy millions of people are affected by such a combination as the recent strike of the American Railway Union. Consider, for instance, the most recent strikes of this character; and before considering them in their other phases it will be well to look at the conditions of the business interests in our country. For many years inflation has been the prevailing tendency, the extravagant exaggeration of values, doing business on borrowed capital, paying a high rate of interest, branching out into all kinds of schemes and speculations. To a great extent, the construction of railways in our country has been overdone. The percentage of railways that are not earning enough to pay the interest on their bonds and stock is very large, especially the great trans-continental lines. A few years ago a single through line, consisting of the Union and Central Pacific roads, was doing the entire business across the continent. Now we have the Southern Pacific; the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe; the Denver & Rio Grande and Oregon Short Line; the Union & Central Pacific; the Northern Pacific; the Great Northern; and the rival to all these, the Canadian Pacific,—practically seven great trans-continental systems. I believe it is a fair statement that none of these roads is now earning enough to pay the interest on its bonds, to say nothing of the interest on its stock. The same may be asserted of a large number of roads east of the great Missouri. Yet, notwithstanding this fact, a few weeks ago the employees on the Great Northern went out on a strike, and that property was seized and held entirely beyond the control of its owners. There were thousands of men in the country who would have been very glad to take the places of the strikers, could they have done so with safety. Almost the same condition existed upon the Northern Pacific when that road was scarcely earning its running expenses.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The next strike of importance was of the operatives of the mines in the central part of the country between Colorado and Pennsylvania, in which very many millions of property was seized and held by the miners for the purpose of forcing an increase of wages. Following this was a strike of the employees of a manufacturing company in a single village and county in the State of Illinois, and after that a strike on all railway lines between the Alleghanies and Pacific Ocean. And next a strike is threatened by all labor organizations extending over the entire country. Now, suppose this should occur, and the five hundred thousand, or million, or even two million union labor men, if there should be so many in the United States, should stop labor, strike, and resort to the depredations recently committed in the city of Chicago, what would the other ten millions of able-bodied men in the United States, all subject to the legislative and executive departments of the Government, be doing in such a crisis ? If this strike of the operatives of the lines of the railways were followed out it would practically mean the seizing of much more than a thousand million dollars' worth of property and the holding of it for an indefinite time, regardless of the rights or desires of the owners, the absolute paralysis of the business of the country, and immeasurable injury to seventy millions of people, to say nothing of the incalculable loss and suffering that must necessarily follow.

There is scarcely a family that is not in some way interested in the peaceful and uninterrupted communication of the railways of the United States. All producers, farmers, manufacturers, mechanics, and men in all positions in life, are interested in the daily communication, in the peaceful and certain operation, of the great lines of commerce of this country. Millions of people are dependent upon them for their daily food; and if the lines should be blocked and paralyzed, famine, pestilence, and death would overshadow thousands of villages and cities that are now enjoying life and prosperity. It would be like the cutting of the great arteries between the heart and the brain of the physical system. In Illinois, the home of Lincoln, Grant, and Douglas, the dying admonition of the latter of whom to his sons was to "maintain the constitution and obey the laws of the country"— and here in the city of Chicago—the result is best illustrated. It is the commercial centre of the richest territory on the earth, the valley of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Mississippi, or that region stretching all the way between the Alleghanies and the Rocky Mountains. The products of this valley largely centre at Chicago. The supplies and necessities of the population occupying that region are distributed from the city of Chicago. This great prosperity and business enterprise have resulted in a great demand for cheap labor. It is safe to say that this city contains more than a million of people who if not born in a foreign land were born of foreign-born citizens, who are gathered here by the success of its great enterprises and industries. There are twenty-three trunk lines of railway centring in this city. The recent so-called strike so far paralyzed the industries of this city as to absolutely block the transportation of freight, passenger, and mail trains on thirteen of the trunk lines, and on ten the business was partially paralyzed, although there were tens of thousands of men in this city and region out of employment, and who would be very glad to take the places of the men who have abandoned their positions, but did not dare to do so on account of the reign of terror that was instigated by the so-called strikers and their sympathizers.

The papers of the city state that during the strike more than a thousand freight cars were set on fire and burned. Forty-five trains were stoned and fired upon by the mobs along the line of the railways. Buildings, station-houses, and railroad property were set on fire and burned. Innocent people travelling in the cars were injured by rocks and pieces of iron and bullets thrown through the windows of the cars. Locomotives were started on the tracks and sent wild along the roads, endangering lives of hundreds of people. On July 5 a mob of ten thousand people gathered in one part of the city and moved nearly three miles along through a dense part of the city, destroying and burning property, and the universal cry of that mob was "To hell with the government!" How near this comes to the carrying out of the declaration of the anarchists of Pennsylvania, who proclaimed that they were "opposed to all private property, and, as the state is the bulwark of property, they were opposed to all government," I need not stop to inquire.

The district where the greatest amount of depredation and most fiendish atrocities were committed was occupied by a class of strikers and their sympathizers who wore the colors or emblems of allegiance to their dictator, Eugene V. Debs, and his as-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sociates, a white ribbon or piece of cloth on the left lapel of the coat; and, in fact, hundreds of men were forced to wear it among the mob by the so-called strikers and their sympathizers.

Another important feature of this usurpation of power is that the great food-producing centre is in this district. The farmers' chief products, meat and bread, are concentrated here and then distributed to all sections of this and other countries. The stock-yards were practically seized and held by the mob under threats to burn the yards if any attempt was made to move the trains bringing in or distributing this great food supply. The same is to some extent true in regard to all food and fuel supplies. The seizing and holding of the avenues which moved the food gathered and distributed at Chicago means suffering and hunger to millions of people in many parts of the United States, and it is safe to say that this condition of affairs would still continue had it not been for the action of the Federal, State, and municipal governments in execution of the laws of the land.

What is said or the amount of language used in any case is not altogether significant except when it is considered by whom said and the circumstances under which expression is given to the thought. He who said "Let us have peace" was in a position to give those four words great significance. So was the General of the Army in 1881 when, in addressing the Society of the Army of the Tennessee, he said, "Beware of the men who make war necessary." The declaration of President Cleveland when he said, "It is the plain duty of the local authorities to maintain peace in that city"; and again, "In this hour of danger and public distress discussion may well give way to active effort on the part of all in authority to restore obedience to law and to protect life and property," is one of lasting significance. Such is the case also when the Chicago *Times* says, editorially, as it did on the morning of July 7th:

> "Such riotous outbreaks as occurred last night on the tracks of the Belt Line, the Alton road, and other railways cannot for a moment be tolerated by the people. They merit the condemnation of every man, be he striker or other citizen, but most of all if he be a striker. More than that, any repetition of them should be averted with powder and ball and cold steel if necessary. Let there be no mistake about that. This nation, this State, this city, will not tolerate vandalism, incendiarism, ruffianism."

This condition of affairs reached such a stage of insurrection that the Mayor of the city found it necessary to appeal to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Governor of the State for five regiments of State troops, the appeal being immediately responded to by an order of the Governor placing the entire brigade at the disposition of the municipal executive.

Now the people can judge whether the acts which drew forth these expressions are in the interest of organized labor, or whether it is red-hot anarchy, insurrectionary and revolutionary! We assert that our government, established by our fathers, and which we have maintained, is the best government for mankind that has ever existed on the face of the globe. Possibly the condition of our citizens is better to-day than it ever will be in the future, but it is the best system of government not only for the rich man but for the poor and the humble. It is the poor man's home and his glory; and the beauty of it all is that our citizens have a peaceful method provided for redressing all wrongs and of improving their condition. The one great *glory* of our system of government, and what our fathers proclaimed it to be, was the independence and absolute security of life, property, and the pursuit of happiness.

The great question now at issue before the American people is not a local one; the question whether one manufacturing concern in one village, or county, or State shall pay its employees more or less, whether it is doing business at a profit or loss, is not the vital issue now. That question may be settled in any way to-day and a similar one arise to-morrow in any other village, on any railroad or in any factory. The question is, Shall life, personal independence, and the rights of property be respected in this country whether belonging to one or many individuals?

If the property of a corporation or company in which the laboring men, the capitalists, the widows and orphans, the savings banks, properties in which any or all our people are interested, cannot be respected and protected, then the cottage, the hamlet, and the little personal property of the humblest citizen is in jeopardy, liable at any moment to be confiscated, seized, or destroyed by any travelling band of tramps. Then any combination or any body of men that threaten the peace, the prosperity, the personal liberty, the life and property of our citizens must be regarded as revolutionary and dangerous, and it is a misfortune that the laboring men employed in railroad transportation have been misled by the harangues of professional agitators into an attitude of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this character. The insurrection must be met and overcome in one of two ways : first by the strong arm of the municipal, State, and Federal governments enforcing the guarantee to all the people, from the humblest to the most exalted, of perfect security in life and property. Otherwise our government would be a rope of sand. The other method of meeting the crisis is for American manhood to assert its principles. Men must take sides either for anarchy, secret conclaves, unwritten law, mob violence, and universal chaos under the red or white flag of socialism on the one hand ; or on the side of established government, the supremacy of law, the maintenance of good order, universal peace, absolute security of life and property, the rights of personal liberty, all under the shadow and folds of "Old Glory," on the other. The red, white, and blue of our national colors are the emblem of law, independence, security, and peace ; and when the crisis comes I have the utmost confidence in the intelligence, the manhood and patriotism, of the great mass of our citizens north, south, east, and west, and believe they will manifest their allegiance to our existing government and to the maintenance of law and good order.

While the millions of our people living in tranquillity and happiness feel so lightly the power of the Government as to scarcely realize its existence, yet the Constitution was framed by our fathers with such consummate wisdom that the authority of law and the supremacy of the government to meet any emergency, insurrection, or rebellion are ample and unquestionable.

Washington suppressed the first serious insurrection by concentrating a large body of troops at Pittsburg, Pa. Lincoln and other Presidents have followed his example. President Hayes did the same thing in 1877 in Pennsylvania and other States. To-day the President not only has the authority to use all the land and naval forces of the United States and of the different States, amounting to nearly a hundred and fifty thousand armed men, but every patriotic and law-abiding citizen among the twelve millions of able-bodied men in this country will heartily support him and the State governors in the maintenance of law and order.

Now would it not be far better for the laboring men as well as all thoughtful citizens to turn their attention to improving the condition of our people in other and more peaceful methods ?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There has been too much concentration in the cities. More of our people should get out into the country, into the pure air and among the birds, flowers, and green fields, where they may cultivate the ground; for really all wealth comes from the ground, directly or indirectly. There is ample opportunity for the occupation of millions of men in addition to those now engaged in such pursuits. As the importation of the vast hordes of cheap labor from China has been stopped on the Pacific Coast, is it to the interest of every intelligent laboring man to stop the importation of the vast hordes of cheap and degraded labor unloaded on our Atlantic coast? We have no use for and should not receive any more than what can readily assimilate with our intelligent, self-respecting, industrious population. Then let us turn our attention to the improvement of our vast unproductive arid lands which by judicious, systematic irrigation are capable of supporting millions of people through the methods of improvement so successfully pursued in India and other countries. Let us pay more attention to commerce, to the end that our ships, built and manned with American labor, and transporting our products to every port on the face of the globe, may give additional occupation to our resolute, enterprising men who are now overcrowding villages, towns, and cities, many of whom are engaged in semi-manly pursuits, and in numerous other ways and methods improve our condition.

In brief, let us not blow down the beautiful arch of our sovereignty—the hope of humanity, the citadel of liberty, independence, the temple of happiness for all mankind. Rather let us follow the avenues of peace, intelligence, and true manhood for the improvement of our condition as a nation and a people; upholding, supporting, and maintaining the supremacy of law and civil government, and cherishing and protecting in all its grandeur and beneficence the blessed inheritance vouchsafed to us by the Fathers.

NELSON A. MILES.

COMMISSIONER HAMPTON:

ALL thoughtful and patriotic citizens not only deplore the condition of affairs brought about by the disgraceful and dangerous strike recently inaugurated by designing demagogues, but they are anxiously considering what remedy can be found to cure the present evil and at the same time to prevent a recurrence of a similar one. The conservative and law-abiding people of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country naturally look to Congress to avert the danger threatening every private and public interest in the country, for the sole authority to do so lies in that body. If our present laws are neither strong enough nor stringent enough to protect the vested rights of our citizens from mob law and communistic combinations, there surely must be patriotism and wisdom sufficient in the law-making department of the Government to frame such laws as will guarantee protection to every citizen, while, at the same time, inflicting condign punishment on those who trample on the rights of their fellow-citizens. No one denies the right of every laboring man to seek remunerative wages for his work, and he is at perfect liberty to quit that work when he thinks his labor is not adequately compensated, but his rights stop there. He has no semblance of right, in law or morals, to prevent another from taking the place he has given up. When employees, from some real or fancied injustice done them, give up the positions they hold, they exercise a clear right; but when by threats and violence they force others to join in unlawful combinations to invade the vested rights of their fellow-citizens, they become law-breakers, and should be treated as criminals.

If these views are correct, then the instigators and originators of the recent strike have been guilty of a grave misdemeanor. For the men who through ignorance or fear have been led into this unlawful procedure I have great sympathy, for many of them are ignorant, and evil advice has carried them to evil courses; but for those leaders who, safe from personal danger, have incited this communistic movement, no reprobation can be too strong, no punishment too severe, and in the interests of law and order it is to be hoped that they may meet their deserts. It is time that the strong arm of the Government should be stretched forth to maintain the supremacy of law, to protect those who are innocent sufferers, to punish those who are guilty, and to repress, with a strong hand if necessary, the anarchy and communism which now bring disgrace on our boasted civilization.

The public press has stated a very significant fact in connection with some of the recent riots, and it is one pregnant with grave and far-reaching considerations. It was announced that in some instances the mob of rioters who committed gross outrages was composed entirely of foreigners, none of whom could speak our language. There has been of late a strong conviction grow-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing up among thinking men of both of the great political parties in the country that our immigration and naturalization laws were too lax, and that the United States were becoming the dumping-ground of the worst elements of foreign population. While this feeling is quite widely entertained by many of all shades of political opinion, neither party has had the courage to grapple with this question nor to take action to avert the danger which threatens our institutions by the unrestricted influx of peoples ignorant of our system of government, entertaining in many cases hostility to all forms of government, and who, driven from their native lands, come hither as communists and anarchists. Immigrants of this class have proved a most pernicious contribution to our citizenship, and they have been in many, if not in most, cases responsible for the riotous outbreaks which have inflicted such incalculable injury on the country. Of course no reflection is meant on those honest immigrants who have linked their destiny with ours and who by their labor and their character have done so much to promote the best interests of the country; but it seems to me that our land should no longer be the refuge of the scum of all Europe, and that every man who makes this his home, whatever his nationality may be, should, while holding his fatherland in tender memory, become at heart an American citizen, with all his hopes, all his aspirations, all his patriotism, centred in the land of his adoption. Our country will then be peopled and governed by true and loyal American citizens, native and adopted, and a homogeneous people will work in harmony to build up, to guard, and to honor the land of their choice. No nobler incentive to ardent patriotism than this can be conceived, no object worthier of attainment. If every American citizen, native and adopted, could be actuated by these motives, communists and anarchists could no longer be allowed to band themselves together to break the laws of the land, to destroy public and private property, or to inaugurate a crusade marked, as this present strike has been, by robbery, arson, and murder.

There can be no possible excuse for conduct such as that which has characterized the acts of the lawless mobs, who, in defiance of all laws, divine and human, blindly and madly struck at the very foundation of all organized society, seemingly only intent on involving the whole country in common ruin. There can be no palliation for outrages such as they have com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted, and their conduct has been as senseless as it is inexcusable, for if in their mad rage they bring about a war of labor against capital, there can be but one result to it—a disastrous one to the originators. Should such a fearful conflict occur, the misguided men, who, under the influence of evil counsels, seek to remedy their grievances by unlawful means, would inevitably be the severest sufferers, for not only would all their means of livelihood be swept away, but hundreds, perhaps thousands, of them would lose their lives.

I have said that this strike was inexcusable. The ostensible reason given for it by the strikers is that Mr. Pullman did not pay his employees sufficient wages. In answer to this charge, Mr. Pullman says that he cannot pay more for the manufacture of a car than the price he can obtain for it from the railroads. Every business man must admit that this answer is conclusive and logical. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that his employees were right in their contention, does that justify a resort on their part, not only against him and his property, but against all property, private as well as public? What justification can be offered for the order of the leaders of all the labor organizations in the country, connected in any manner with the railroads, that each member should at once throw up his position as evidence of sympathy with the Pullman employees?

And above all other inexplicable questions suggested by the action of the Pullman employees, what semblance of right had these men, who had voluntarily left their employment, to combine unlawfully with men whose object was the destruction of the railroads and of property of all other descriptions? The workmen of the Pullman company were not connected with railroads in any manner; their sole business was in the construction of sleeping cars, and yet, when they threw up their position, they joined in the work of wrecking the roads, obstructing travel, stopping the mails, and defying the laws of the land. Another strange feature in this matter is the action taken by A. R. U., an organization in no wise connected with the Pullman company, but, notwithstanding this fact, this body of railroad employees decreed that no railroad should use Pullman cars! The railroads, many of which were under contract to use these cars, naturally and properly paid no respect to this order emanating as it did from an irresponsible source, whereupon these sympathetic strikers of the A. R. U.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

became enemies of the public peace, and resorted to violence, robbery, and bloodshed, to enforce their lawless demands. And these things are done on our own soil, where it has been the proud boast that the laws were supreme, guaranteeing to every citizen equal rights! But it seems that the new doctrine announced by the A. R. U. puts the railroads of the country outside of the pale of the law, leaving the vast interests of these corporations, as well as those of their bondholders, at the mercy of any mob of ignorant or vicious men. To our shame, too, there are men in high position who uphold these careless proceedings and who defend the perpetrators. We have surely fallen on strange and evil times, and conservative men of all sections and of all parties should devote all efforts to the restoration of order and the maintenance of law. There is not one present vested right of individuals, of corporations, or one of government ownership of property that would be safe if the criminal acts recently committed by riotous mobs in several of the States are permitted to go unpunished. Life itself would no longer be safe, for in more than one instance murder was added to the long list of atrocities which marked the carnival of crime that held mad sway of late in many portions of our country. And the hollow pretence given by those strikers for the outrages they committed is the assertion that they were endeavoring to aid the former workmen of the Pullman company. Every interest of the country is to be sacrificed, every vested right is to be trampled upon, every principle of law and of morals is to be violated, simply because workmen engaged in a particular business cannot obtain the wages they demand. How could these workmen be possibly benefited by the lawless and indiscreet conduct of such misguided sympathizers? No right, no principle, can be established by the commission of a wrong.

For this unholy alliance between unemployed workmen and the disreputable and worst elements of our population to succeed would, indeed, be the consecration of a crime. The President has been criticised, even denounced, because he attempted to prevent the consummation of the crimes contemplated against the peace, the honor, and the welfare of the country; and the ground upon which this attack on him is based is that his action has been in violation of the rights of States. No one upholds whatever of State's rights is left to us more earnestly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than myself, but I can see no force in the charge that the President has, by his course, exceeded the authority conferred on him by the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance of that instrument. Those who hold that the President has, by sending Federal troops to the scenes of disorder, exceeded his power predicate their opinion on Sec. 4, Article 4, of the Constitution, which authorizes Congress to send troops to any State "to protect it against invasion, and, on application of the legislature (or of the executive when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence." The meaning of this provision is perfectly clear. Congress is authorized to send troops to any State on the call of the legislature, or of the governor, under certain conditions, when the authorities of such State are unable to repel invasion or to repress domestic violence. But those who criticise the acts of the President forget that Congress has enacted laws which confer on the chief magistrate larger and wider powers than those given to Congress by the Constitution. The authority for the exercise of those powers is found in Sections 5298 and 5299 of the Revised Statutes. A reference to these laws will prove that the President not only has absolute power to call on the Federal forces to suppress "any insurrection, violence, unlawful combination or conspiracy" occurring in any State, and indeed it is made "his duty to take such measures, by the employment of the militia, or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necessary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence or combinations." These quotations from Section 5299 are sufficient to show how ample is the authority of the President to deal with such cases as those confronting him now, and it should be a source of heart-felt congratulation to all law-abiding citizens that the executive chair is now filled by one, who, knowing what his duty demanded of him, had the courage to discharge it promptly, fully, and fearlessly. There is another potent reason why the Federal authorities should have been called on to intervene in suppressing the riots which occurred, and why the shield of Federal authority should have been interposed for the protection of property. The government has millions of dollars invested in the trans-continental railroads, secured by mortgages on these roads, and it was the clear duty of the President to use all the means in his power to guard this immense

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property from destruction, for the whole country is interested in its preservation. Lawless mobs have not only stopped traffic and travel on these roads, thus cutting off the legitimate revenue due to the Government, but they have in many instances destroyed the roads and burned the bridges on them. If such outrages are permitted to go unpunished, our laws are a farce, for they give protection neither to life nor to property. Every consideration of duty, self-respect, honor, interest, demands that the majesty of the law should be vindicated whatever the cost of doing so may be. Every humane man must feel profound sympathy for all honest toilers where labor does not yield proper remuneration; but no legislation, no government, no earthly power, can rectify the immutable law by which the gifts of fortune are distributed with an unequal hand. It has been so since the beginning of the world and it will probably so continue to the end, or to the millennium, for our Divine Master said, "The poor ye have always with you."

All civilized nations have tried to solve the labor problem, and all have tried in vain. In this country the conditions tending to a solution are more favorable than in any other, for with our boundless and fertile acres now lying waste, every prudent man can acquire a home at a small cost, and a landowner is rarely an anarchist or a socialist. If the vast army of unemployed laborers, or of those whose labor is not adequately compensated, could be settled in their own homes, while they might not accumulate riches, they would be independent, and the fact that their homes were their own would make them conservative, law-abiding citizens. The danger then of such strikes as have recently convulsed the country would be lessened, if not averted. What will follow now that this strike is suppressed, entailing untold suffering and widespread ruin on the misguided men who have taken part in it? is a subject for serious consideration. It is to be hoped that when the normal condition of affairs is reëstablished the railroad authorities will deal gently with all their employees who, confessing their wrongdoing, ask for reinstatement. Many of these men were led astray through ignorance, and others were forced by threats to join their comrades. These men deserve pity, not punishment. For the unscrupulous leaders, who, at a safe distance from danger, exposed their unfortunate dupes to probable death and to certain ruin, no condemnation can be too

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emphatic, no punishment too severe. Whatever may be the outcome of the unhappy condition of affairs now prevailing, every patriotic citizen must cherish the fervent hope that, while the supremacy of the laws is maintained, a satisfactory and peaceful adjustment of all differences may be arrived at, and that the country may be spared the dreadful consequences which would follow an armed conflict between labor and capital.

WADE HAMPTON.

MR. ROBINSON:

IT is as old as Plato (and therefore presumably older), that though revolutions break out on trivial occasions, the underlying causes are never trivial. They arise *out of* small things, but *about* great ones.

The grievance of the men at Pullman—the question whether they should receive 25 cents more or less for a day's labor—was not the cause of the strikes and riots which followed. It was only an excuse for precipitating a conflict which had been already decided upon, and which must have come sooner or later.

Those who have been in any measure conversant with the currents of thought in what are known as "labor circles" have seen the clouds that were gathering, not only for months past, but for some years. Had the country not encountered the financial depression of the last twelve months, their breaking might have been delayed for some time yet. But it was a question of time only. The storm could not have been finally averted.

Long before the financial crisis of 1893, the leaders of certain labor organizations talked freely enough of their plans and ambitions, even outside of the lodgerooms. These plans and ambitions, it should be distinctly understood, have contemplated nothing less than a general industrial rebellion, through which, by mere force of numbers, the labor organizations of the country proposed to obtain control of the legislative and administrative machinery of this government. The cardinal tenets of the approved modern labor doctrine are two:

(1) The workingmen,—by which is meant the wage-earners by manual labor,—being the chief producers of the wealth of the country, are entitled to the guiding voice in its government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2) The workingmen, when properly organized and under proper leadership, are strong enough to take by force, if necessary, that to which they are entitled.

The chief obstacle which the labor leaders found in the way of acting upon this doctrine was the lack of that proper organization which was confessedly necessary to success. Considering the employees of the railways alone, there were, two years ago, some 850,000 men employed on the railways of the United States in all capacities. Over 700,000 of these were included in the various classes of wage-earners by manual labor. Each of these classes has long had its particular organization. Some have had more than one. But the aggregate membership of all these organizations (unions, orders, brotherhoods, and associations combined) amounted to less than 150,000; so that more than three-fourths of the entire working forces of the railways were "unorganized." Moreover, there existed jealousies between the different orders and brotherhoods, which prevented their co-operating when trouble arose, and more than once it has occurred that railway companies have come victorious out of formidable strikes largely by the assistance of these jealousies, and by the activity displayed by one organization in helping to defeat another.

For many years there have been at intervals attempts made to harmonize the differences existing between the several organizations, either so that they might, while maintaining their individualities as separate orders, unite in alliances of offence and defence, or so that they might become merged in one comprehensive brotherhood. In the last three or four years, the attempts to achieve "federation" of the railway orders have been numerous, and on more than one occasion have held out some promise of success. The practical results attained, however, were insignificant. Then arose the order which has of late become so conspicuous, the American Railway Union. The Union, instead of aiming at the consolidation of existing orders (the constitution of the Union declaring this to be "impracticable") began by soliciting recruits among the 600,000 or so of "unorganized employees," trusting to its ultimate success among these to give it such commanding strength among railway orders that sooner or later the other organizations would be compelled to suffer themselves to be absorbed into it.

This process, which has been going on among the railway

PRODUCED BY UNZ:ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers, has been dwelt upon at some length because it is typical of what has been done in other lines. As the railway Union has arisen, so, allowing for differences in conditions, there have been created the other Unions, Councils, and Federations. Nor has it been accidental that these movements towards consolidation have gone on concurrently in different fields. Each movement massed a certain number of regiments into a corps; but the leaders have always thoroughly understood and have deliberately intended that these corps should, when the time came, co-operate together, as one grand army—each separate, yet all united, when unity of action is required," in the words of a pronunciamento issued over a year ago. The objects for which this army was to be united have been already explained.

That when the conflict came it should break out first upon the railways was perhaps natural, inasmuch as by striking at the arteries of commerce the vital parts of the social organism could be most quickly reached. None the less, it was in large measure also an accident, an accident growing chiefly out of the hot-headedness of certain of the leaders of the Railway Union. In its essence the disturbance was no more a railway strike than it was a Pullman strike. The men who left their places on the railways had no grievances. They had no more concern with the affairs of the builders of freight cars in the Pullman shops than had the Association of Iron and Steel Workers or any other labor organization. Their only concern was the common one of what is known as the cause of organized labor. This is the essential fact to be borne in mind: that the outbreak was not an outbreak of certain employees of particular companies against whom they conceived themselves to have grievances, but it was a demonstration in behalf of all organized labor against all classes of employers. It was an insurrection of certain sections of the wage-earning class against constituted society. That it was happily confined within comparatively narrow limits is the result simply of the fact that the more experienced leaders of a few organizations regarded the late outbreak as premature, and the season (when so many men are unemployed and ready to take strikers' places) as unpropitious for the final conflict.

The American people are extraordinarily patient and slow to take alarm. It was not until the strikers had openly laughed at the injunctions of the Federal courts—not until the mob was in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actual resistance to the military force of the United States—not until long after that point was passed at which in any other civilized country of the world the trains of the blockaded lines would have been moving again between lines of bayonets—that the general public appeared to awaken to even an approximate understanding of what the crisis signified. Even now, to the public mind, the outbreak chiefly presents itself as a quarrel between certain railway companies and their employees, which, unfortunately but only incidentally, developed later into open lawlessness and an opposition to the Federal authority. The reverse is the truth. The strike was primarily a demonstration of force on behalf of organized labor against the general social conditions of the country. It was only accidental that it occurred on certain railways.

It is noticeable that the first of the public utterances which served to set the public in some measure upon its guard—the first open defiance of the Federal authority—did not come from any railway employee or officer of the Railway Union. It was a leader of the Federation of Labor who first declared that if the government should interfere the members of all labor organizations would be called out from one end of the country to the other. Since it has become evident that the government did propose to interfere, others have become equally frank. The president of the American Railway Union declared that "the first shot fired from a soldier's rifle will be the signal for a revolution, and ninety per cent. of the people of the United States will be found on one side against ten per cent. on the other." The strikers repeatedly laughed at the idea that the United States troops ("a mere handful of twenty-five thousand men") could prevail against "the masses of organized labor."

As has already been stated, the more sagacious of the labor leaders did not approve of the course of the American Railway Union. They considered the time for a general revolt of the labor orders to be ill-chosen, and thought that a *casus belli* more likely to command popular sympathy than the cause of the men at Pullman might have been awaited. The work of federation, moreover, is still far from completed. There are many orders which have not yet given their adhesion to the "sympathetic" idea—the idea of a common cause of all workingmen, by which the grievance of one man against one employer is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the quarrel of all employees against society. Even among the railway organizations, there are such orders as the Order of Railway Conductors and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers which have no comradeship with the Railway Union, and which bore themselves with dignity in the recent crisis. On these grounds, the leaders of some of the other organizations, while entirely in sympathy with the general aim of the American Railway Union, doubted the wisdom of making the insurrection general.

The plans of campaign, which have been so long maturing, will not be abandoned because one premature and ill-advised excursion has miscarried. The writer has no wish to be an alarmist, but it is desirable the people of the United States should understand thoroughly what the "cause of organized labor" means to-day. The leaders of the cause may not consider that the ends which they seek to attain will necessarily have to be attained through bloodshed and by the force of armed rebellion. If it should prove possible through the instrumentality of the Third Party, and by combination with the various miscellaneous elements of discontent which are now abroad in the land, to reach by peaceful and constitutional means that mastery of society and that control of the machinery of government to which they aspire, they would unquestionably prefer it so. But let it not be forgotten that, whatever their preference for peaceful means may be, they fully believe themselves capable in the last resort of having the power to gain their ends by force, and clearly contemplate the possibility of having to use that power.

When Senator C. K. Davis, of Minnesota, warned the members of the American Railway Union of his State, before the government had decided to intervene with its military force, that they were "rapidly approaching the overt act of levying war upon the United States" he only stated a fact which was already entirely familiar to the leaders of the labor orders. They knew that they were embarking upon rebellion. The word had no terror for them, because, as we have seen, they believed themselves to be strong enough to win.

This is the situation which confronts the public. The labor organizations do not include a majority of all the workingmen of the United States, nor all the organizations inspired with the same lawless and desperate spirit. In some organizations, whose leaders are parties to the conspiracy, it is uncertain how far, in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last resort, the rank and file of the members would give those leaders the support which they count upon. There still remains, however, a sufficient residuum of treason to make the prospect of an united uprising something altogether too serious to be lightly treated. The forces of rebellion have upon their side some members of the United States Senate, more members of the lower House of Congress, and three or four governors of States; though how far these gentlemen have their eyes open to the real meaning of the doctrines which they encourage, they alone perhaps can say. The movement itself is not strictly a movement of anarchy, though it would have all the forces of anarchy upon its side. That it is a conspiracy against the public peace there can be no question.

Forewarned is forearmed; and if the people of the United States are wise it may not in the end be an unfortunate thing that the American Railway Union saw fit to take up the cause of the Pullman strikers. It has given to the country a representation—as it were in dress rehearsal—of the part which organized labor proposes to play in the national drama, and which it *will* play, unless forcibly withheld, when the right time arrives. The issue of the battle which threatens would not remain long in doubt. The Republic is not yet in its dotage, and will know how to cope with rebellion when it comes. But while listening to the pleas of labor agitators and the champions of organized labor—whether in the press or from the platform, in legislative halls or from gubernatorial chairs—it is well that the people should know and remember that it *is* rebellion which these organizations contemplate. It is revolution which they hope to attain—by peaceful means, if may be; by force, if must.

The ear of the country is always ready to hearken to the cry of the workingman. The heart of the country is tender and quick to be touched by the tale of the wage-earner's suffering. But the country cannot afford to be kind or soft-hearted to treason. Let no man flatter himself that these latest strikes are no more, and bear no deeper significance, than other strikes which have gone before. Former disorders have been but sporadic outbreaks, resulting from local causes. This last is the development of a deep-seated malady, a cancerous growth, which has been deliberately implanted in the social system of the country, and has been fostered there till it has struck roots, which will not be torn out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without the rending of tissue and the spilling of blood. Its existence is a menace to the nation.

H. P. ROBINSON.

MR. GOMPERS:

ON Decoration Day, May 30, 1894, Judge Grosscup, of the United States Courts, in his oration commemorative of the day, took occasion to say that "the growth of labor organizations must be checked by law," yet when the sounds of his voice had scarcely died away we had in the midst of us the greatest and most extensive labor struggle that has ever taken place among the wage-workers of America, and possibly of the world.

Thousands of miles of railroads in all directions have been at a standstill, and nearly a hundred thousand workmen in voluntary idleness to secure what they regard as justice to their fellow workmen. It has been questioned whether the boycott or strike was wise or whether it was justifiable. On the first question there may be some difference of opinion. It may sincerely be doubted whether it was wise for an organization such as the American Railway Union, within a year of its formation, to attempt to inaugurate a movement which, in its inception, of necessity, assumed gigantic proportions.

The policy or wisdom of entering into so great a movement without consultation with, or against the advice of, the older railroad and *bona-fide* labor organizations of the country is open, to serious question. Nor will I attempt from the usual standpoint of trade dispute to justify the strike. Sufficient for me are the facts which provoked it and to which I shall allude later; but that the railroadmen deliberately entered a contest which entailed many sacrifices and dangers in an attempt to redress grievances not of their own, but of other workmen, who, having become thoroughly enervated and impoverished, without organization or previous understanding, in sheer desperation threw down their work, is indeed to their credit.

A little more than twenty years ago George M. Pullman conceived the idea of starting, in connection with his car shops, a town—one that should bear his name and hand down to posterity a monument of his enterprise and philanthropy. He built houses for his employees to live in, stores to make their purchases in, and churches to do their praying in. The workers were told their in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terests and Mr. Pullman's were one and the same, that what would bring him a greater prosperity would redound to their advantage. They were warned that to belong to a trade-union would be inimical to their *joint* enterprise, hence workmen who would purpose forming a union among them would be discharged, regarded as a common enemy, and driven out of town. They were to depend entirely upon Mr. Pullman's generosity and foresight in all things.

The result was that the workers at Pullman were huddled together in the (outwardly) neat houses, for which they were required to pay higher rents than are paid for similar accommodations in Chicago. They were reduced in wages as often as the seasons would recur and opportunities either arose or were made. This was carried on until last February, when a reduction in wages was offered varying from 25 to 33⅓ and in a few instances 50 per cent.

Here are a few figures which may be taken as a fair criterion of the extent of the reduction in wages offered:

	Price per piece, 1893.	Price offered, 1894.
Making trolley roofs.....	$2.25	$1.40
Framework car seat..... ...	1.25	.79
Cutting carpets.....	3.00	1.50
Making mattresses double..	.25	.15
Cutting brussels carpet.....	2.50	1.10
Blacksmith work, platform..	4.00	2.65
Truck setting	.45	.16
Sleeping car bodies.....	180.00	115.50

The workmen being driven to desperation, a meeting was held. Who called it no one knows; how it came about not a vestige of evidence is at hand. It was held and a committee appointed to wait upon Mr. Pullman or a representative of the company, to show that it was absolutely impossible to live on the wages offered; that a middle ground should be sought; that if wages were to be reduced the rents should also come down. Instead of the request of the men being considered by Mr. Pullman, the committee was summarily dismissed and discharged almost instantly. Is it surprising that these men in their rude awakening, finding themselves injured and insulted and their spokesmen discharged and blacklisted, and themselves without an organization to protect or defend them, without the means of properly laying their grievances before organized labor of the country, struck work, declaring that they might as well remain idle and starve as work and slowly meet that fate?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Organized labor of Chicago becoming aware of the unusual commotion at Pullman did not hold against the workers of that town their previous refusals to organize. It was readily appreciated that these men had been wholly misled by false promises and covert threats. Relief committees were at once formed, and it is firmly declared that the average workmen of that town have fared better since they engaged in the contest and fraternized with their fellow-workmen than they have for the past two years while working.

It was during this time, when relief committees from the Pullman strikers were making their visits to organizations, that the American Railway Union was holding its first convention in Chicago, and a committee called upon it for its financial and moral assistance. A committee from the convention was appointed to wait upon the company with the request that the matter in dispute might be submitted to arbitration. The committee was told that there was nothing to arbitrate and that the company refused to discuss the matter at all. Insulted, humiliated by the manner their disinterested efforts at restoring amicable relations between Mr. Pullman and his former servile employees were received, the committee made its report. The convention in a moment reflected the feelings of the committee, and though at first sullen, silent, and indignant they resolved amidst the wildest enthusiasm that unless the Pullman company either adjusted the matter in controversy with their employees or submitted it to arbitration the members of the American Railway Union would not handle Pullman cars and would ask all workmen to act likewise. No heed was given to the request, resolution, or threat (call it what you will), and the great boycott (strike) was on.

I can scarcely bring myself to the belief that the convention imagined that the movement would be as extended as it became into, nor that it would last as long as it did. Be that as it may, we certainly found ourselves in the midst of one of the greatest labor struggles.

Now comes the question repeated: Was the strike wise or justifiable? the answer to which must always depend upon the character and position of the party giving it. As to the wisdom, time only can tell. Since "nothing succeeds so well as success" in all efforts of life, I presume this element will finally set its *quietus* upon this consideration of the subject. But was it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justifiable? From the standpoint of the employer, No. From the standpoint of a labor organization having an agreement with an employer whose provisions a strike would violate, No. From the standpoint of the A. R. U., having no agreement with either of the railroad companies involved, and expressing the inarticulate protest of the masses against the wrongs inflicted upon any of their brothers and their yearning for justice to all mankind, Yes; a thousand times yes.

It is something not yet fully understood how thoroughly organized labor stands as the sturdy pioneer of all the hopes of the masses for justice and humane conditions, of their aspirations for a nobler manhood resultant from an equality of opportunities. It is in consequence of these facts that organized labor feels itself frequently called upon to espouse the cause of those who have neglected their own interests, and who have even antagonized any effort to bring them within the fold of organization. Laboring men feel and know that the wealth producers would certainly avail themselves of their only means of defending and advancing their position in life were it not that they in many instances had their prejudices aroused and their ignorance of actual conditions preyed upon by the instruments of their oppression in the hands of the corporate and employing class. But the men are on strike, the police armed to the teeth are on guard to protect life and property, the militia are called out ostensibly for the same purpose, and the regular army of the United States are marshalled into the fields by order of the President to enforce injunctions, restraining "everybody" from even writing a letter, issued by the Judge who only a few days before expressed the firm conviction that the growth of labor organizations must be checked by law.

Is it not somewhat strange that the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Law, a law passed by Congress in compliance with the demand of the people of our country to protect them against the greed and outrageous discriminations of the railroads, can be distorted to such a degree as to appall its authors and promoters, and should be perverted from its true purpose, and made to do service as an instrument to oppress the parties to whom it was never intended to apply, workingmen engaged in a contest to redress grievances. One may look almost in vain for the restraint the law has put upon the avarice and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

injustice practised by the railroad corporations. The reform elements in our country seem to have unconsciously created their own Frankenstein, the breath of life being injected into it by plutocracy in the shape of ill-gotten gains.

There is no desire nor even a tendency on the part of organized labor to have its movement go beyond the limits of the law, but I submit that there is a standpoint from which this great problem should be considered other than a judge's injunction, a policeman's club, or the point of the bayonet. The fact of the matter is that industrial conditions have changed to a wonderful extent within the past thirty years, that wealth has been accumulated as never before, that new forces are at play in the production and transportation of wealth, and that the civil law of our States and country has simply not kept pace in becoming accommodated to the altered conditions. Do what you will, declaim as you may, industrial and commercial development cannot be confined within the limits of laws enacted to fit past decades the theories of which are sought to be applied to modern conditions.

Civilization of the past and present is based upon labor, and yet the laborer has no standing nor protection in the economy of our life. It may well be asked, if the state refuses to deal out some degree of justice and guarantee protection to labor, what interest has the laborer in the state? As a matter of fact the organizations of labor are endeavoring to secure that protection and guaranty to the workingmen which the state has failed to take cognizance of. Without organization the workmen would simply be reduced to a much worse condition than the slaves in ante-bellum days, and all attempts to strain the law, construing the exercise of natural rights to be criminal, will only react upon the heads of the legal prestidigitators.

If in monarchical England, with its old and effete traditions and crusty customs, Parliament can afford to liberalize its laws and legalize the action of workingmen engaged in the maintenance of their organizations and their effort to obtain better conditions, certainly the Republic of these United States should not only keep pace with that spirit, but advance beyond it, and not bring the entire military and civil forces to aid the strong and help crush out the weak.

Labor cannot, and will not if it could, utilize the process of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

securing legislation by the use of money; it relies upon the justice of its cause, the nobility of its purposes, the humanizing influences of its efforts.

Mr. Pullman, it is said, is willing to spend millions of dollars if necessary to bring his former employees "to their senses." That is to say, he is willing to spend millions of dollars to bring his workmen to the sense of their utter dependence upon him.

This is evidently his purpose. It is the purpose of many another corporation king. He and a few others may possibly win for the present, but the people of America, when once aroused to a sense of the wrong inflicted upon them, will not be slow in so shaping our laws and industrial conditions as to surprise their most supercilious critics.

We insist upon the right to organize, the right to think, to act; to protect ourselves, our homes, and our liberties, and work out our emancipation. We are confident we shall secure them, and that the world will stand surprised that they were accomplished through the means of an enlightened public opinion and by peaceful means.

SAMUEL GOMPERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLISH WORKMEN AND THEIR POLITICAL FRIENDS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN E. GORST, M. P.

In every constituency in the United Kingdom the wage-earners and those whose interests are like theirs form the overwhelming majority of the electors. Their political power, if they knew how to use it, would be irresistible: they could confer the government upon whomsoever they would. In the House of Commons, on the contrary, labor questions are thrust into the background; prominence is given to personal squabbles and party manœuvres in which the workers have not the slightest interest; there is no leisure for the discussion of those subjects which directly affect their welfare. What is the explanation of this strange contrast between the omnipotence of the working class in the country and its impotence in Parliament?

At elections the "workingman" is always brought prominently to the fore. The election addresses of candidates are filled with professions of devotion to his welfare. But so soon as the friends of workers have succeeded in persuading them to give a majority to their political party, their zeal for the interests of labor is choked by cares for other matters more important to their ascendancy in Parliament. So far from successive governments making it their first object to supply the wants and gratify the wishes of the class to which they appeal almost exclusively when seeking power, social legislation is without scruple put on one side to make way for measures by which the party in power hopes to consolidate its position, or is compelled to buy the adhesion of its supporters, or for those discussions about the personal conduct of distinguished individuals, in which political people take so much delight. During the two years that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the present government has been in office, its solitary achievement in social legislation is a law for regulating the hours of railway servants on a plan drawn up by a committee of the former House of Commons. A very limited extension of the liability of employers for accidents to their workmen was abandoned, because the Government quarrelled with the House of Lords upon an amendment of no practical importance. The Radical party have tried to hide their failure to legislate, by taking party credit for administrative changes in the Home Office and Board of Trade, which their leaders found in progress when they succeeded to the government. Everybody who has been behind the scenes in a government office knows how little the party color of the Parliamentary head for the time being affects such developments.

The reason why the class so powerful at the polls is so impotent in the House of Commons is not far to seek. It is because it has no policy in which the workers generally are agreed, and no leaders whom the workers generally trust.

The Radical party tries persistently to turn labor questions into party questions, and to represent themselves as the sole friends of the working class. One of these leaders went so far as to declare a short time ago that in reference to labor questions there was more difference between the best Tory and the worst Liberal than there was between the worst Liberal and the best Liberal. But in spite of their indecent zeal, of which the above is a specimen, to arrogate to themselves the leadership of the labor party, they fail for several reasons to gain the confidence of the workers. First, they have no policy, except the extension of franchises and the multiplication of elections. The workers look to America and Australia, where the development of democracy is complete, and perceive there labor troubles worse than our own; their faith in Radicalism is shaken by the spectacle. Next they are committed to important sections of their followers to carry out organic changes. Until they have established Home Rule in Ireland, destroyed the Church in Wales, and carried out other items of the Newcastle programme they will not be allowed to devote the time of Parliament to social legislation. Lastly, they are embarrassed by a large number of rich capitalists among their most valued supporters—the "worst Liberals" for whom an apology has to be made. It is difficult for a rich man with the best intentions to acquire real sympathy for the suffering of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the poor; it is impossible for capitalists, as a class, to prefer the interests of the workers to their own.

It is an established principle of the leaders of the Conservative party to make no declaration of policy in opposition. The maxim is handed down as a tradition of the great Sir Robert Peel, who would say, "When I am called in, I will prescribe." If, therefore, the present leaders of that party have a labor policy, they are not likely to reveal it until the next time they have a majority in parliament. Moreover they have a laudable objection to make promises and raise expectations which they do not clearly see their way to fulfil. They have never imitated the political profligacy of their opponents in arrogating to themselves the title of the sole friends of the workingman. The Conservative party has in relation to labor questions one great advantage, which the people are beginning to realize: it is not pledged to organic change, and has therefore in office more leisure for social legislation. This is the explanation of the undoubted fact that more of the recent laws for the benefit of the workers have been passed under Conservative than under Radical administrations.

No independent Labor party in the House of Commons at present exists. The name is usurped by a section of the supporters of government who take advantage of their position as trades-union leaders to claim the working-class vote for the party to which they belong. They have no definite policy upon which they are all agreed, and they must on critical occasions postpone the interests of labor to those of the government, or the party to which they are attached would cast them out. To make an independent party in Parliament, two conditions are essential: first, a leader whom the members of the party will follow; and secondly, a policy or a principle to which the party is able and willing to sacrifice without remorse the interests of the Conservative and Radical parties alike. Mr. Parnell and the Irish once had such a party. When the labor leaders are in a position to fulfil, as he did, these two conditions, an independent labor party may become a reality.

Though there is comparatively little that changes in the law can do to improve the condition of the workers, yet there are certain measures which have a tendency in this direction and which could be carried without shaking the foundations of society, without altering the laws of property, and without letting in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violent or revolutionary change. But in reference to these, no political leader has any definite plan to recommend, and at present there is no prospect of anything practical being done. The public enthusiasm is wanting which, in our Constitution, is requisite to turn a project into a law, and this want is not likely to be supplied until education has made the workers far better judges of their own interests and necessities. Let us proceed to examine some of these questions now ripe for action, and inquire what are the particular circumstances under which each of them has been brought for the moment to a standstill.

First of all, there is the question, which a Royal Commission has been considering for three years, how to settle trade disputes between employer and employed without a labor war. Every one admits that it is desirable to have some method more rational and less costly than a strike or a lockout. But just as every one admits the folly and wickedness of war, while the peoples of the world continue to convert their youth into soldiers, and to waste their labor in manufacturing instruments of destruction, so, in spite of the acknowledged folly of the system, workers go on striking, employers go on locking out, and the public sentiment in favor of industrial peace remains a mere pious opinion. The capitalist knows the losses which a strike inflicts on his industry ; the workers are aware of the heavy tax, in the shape of contributions to their union, which they have to pay in times of industrial peace, of the loss of wages, the dissipation of their property, the starvation of their wives and children, they have to endure in an industrial war. But each party is contented with fruitless lamentation ; neither stirs itself up to energetic reform.

The Royal Commission of Labor, after three years' consideration, could recommend nothing more practical than the encouragement of voluntary tribunals of conciliation and arbitration, but they pointed out in their own report that such institutions could only succeed in organized trades; and it may be estimated from their report that the unorganized exceed the organized workers in a proportion of at least six to one. In fact it is the weaker party in a trade dispute that calls for conciliation and arbitration. The stronger will not hear of interference. The Homestead strike in Pennsylvania in 1892 would have been averted if the employers who were the stronger had been willing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to negotiate, or if any public authority had existed capable of forcing them to do so.

It was proved, in the investigation of the causes of this strike by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States, that the reductions proposed by the employers were right; that the men were ready and anxious to negotiate; that they would have yielded at an early stage of the conflict before bloodshed had taken place; but that the manager of the employers persistently refused to meet them. The result was that eleven people were killed, a large number maimed and injured, the men lost £200,000 of wages, the company incurred a heavy loss of which the amount has not been stated, and the public were put to an expense of £88,000 in guards, militia, and police. If any public body had been charged with the duty of mediating at the beginning of the trouble, and had possessed authority to bring the parties together, all this would have been averted. And it must be remembered that it is not only these public sensational strikes that have to be taken into account. There are petty local labor disputes going on continually all over the industrial world, which together cause a sum of misery greater than the conspicuous misfortunes of the greater strikes, which alone attract the attention of the public. Where is a political force to be found that will compel the government and legislature to take this matter in hand, and think out a scheme for the rational settlement of trade disputes? The capitalists are interested in preventing the waste of capital which labor wars occasion; but in the case of unorganized labor, with which they chiefly have to deal, they feel their position so strong that they do not desire outside interference; and in organized trades, where they are weak, they doubt whether an award adverse to the workers would be carried out. The labor leaders, who represent organized trades only, rely exclusively on their organization, and they look upon the helplessness of the unorganized as a valuable means of driving them into combination. The nation, it is true, has the strongest moral right to interfere, for it has not only to defray the costs of keeping the ring while the fight goes on, but has its interests and welfare jeopardized in all the ramifications of its complicated industries by the stoppage of any particular branch. But public interests are not supported by the educated opinion of the workers, and are swamped in the House of Commons by those of capitalists and trades-union

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members. The five-sixths of the workers, who, being defenceless in a trade dispute, would gain by the establishment of any power to stand between them and an unreasonable employer, are dumb, ignorant, and unrepresented in the House of Commons. There is no force at present to overcome the inertia of government and Parliament; and the establishment of tribunals of conciliation and arbitration is not yet within the sphere of practical politics.

Of all labor questions there is none upon which the workers are more nearly of one mind than the movement for shortening the hours of labor. The desire for more leisure is honorable to the workers. It is begotten, not of idleness, but of an aspiration after higher things. They wish for opportunities of better culture, nobler family life, and occupations fitting them for the position of citizens. In a very large number of industries the shortening of hours would result, as experience has shown, in greater efficiency of labor, increased output, and better workmanship. In unhealthy trades the restriction of the time during which the worker is exposed to danger and disease is called for both in his interest and in that of the community upon which the cost of maintaining disabled workers ultimately falls. In such callings as those of railway and train men, where shortness of time cannot be compensated by increase of efficiency, the restriction of hours might call up some from the army of the unemployed into the ranks of active labor. From every point of view, the end aimed at is desirable. But no practical method by which the aim of the workers can be fulfilled is yet invented. The joint committees of some of the highly organized trades in the north of England have successfully dealt with the question of hours; and, hastily generalizing from this example, the political world declares that the end is best to be attained by trades-union effort. Yes, it possibly could be so attained by the organized workers if they were prepared to run the risk of having to go through the agonies of a strike; but the five-sixths of the workers who are unorganized, and amongst whose industries the worst examples of unduly long hours are to be found, cannot obtain their object by this method. The organization which makes the Northumberland miners or the Cleveland ironworkers so strong is for them an impossibility. They are compelled in any question to yield to the views of their employers, unless some outside authority comes to their support. It has taken many years to induce the manufacturing departments of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government, which are the servants of the people, and profess to be model employers of labor, to follow the example set by the best employers in the private trade. The Eight-Hours Miners' Bill, to which the majority of the members of the House of Commons pledged themselves at the last election, has made slow progress in Parliament. For the general body of workers nothing is being done. The universal Eight-Hours Bill everybody knows to be impracticable. The trades-union congresses pass annually resolutions by overwhelming majorities in its favor; but trades-union leaders have no special knowledge of the case of the unorganized workers, and no mandate to speak on their behalf. If there is to be any authority to which workers generally can appeal for the curtailment of hours of labor, it must be a local authority, which will have to decide the question with regard to local circumstances. No party in the state has yet committed itself to any scheme for the creation of such an authority, and there is no strong public opinion to support it if it did.

The existence in our great cities of masses of unemployed or half-employed workers is admitted to be a national danger, and the question how to deal with them to be the most urgent and difficult political problem of the day. If modern civilization is destined to be swept away, this is the class which is most likely to act the part which the barbarians did towards the Roman Empire. In the organized trades the inevitable want of work in slack times or in the intervals between the close of one job and the beginning of another, is dealt with by the unions. The worker, for the time out of employment, is subsidized out of the common fund; he was formerly helped to find work by being provided with the means to travel about in search of it; now the more rational mode is adopted of indicating to him, by means of information supplied by the branches of the union, the particular place in which work is likely to be found; his distress and difficulty are thus reduced to a minimum. But in the unorganized trades, which I cannot often enough impress upon the reader contain the vast majority of the workers, the malady of want of work rages unchecked. Invention of machinery and changes of fashion are continually swelling the ranks of the "unskilled" with workers whose skill is no longer wanted. Of the men who used to make dressing-cases in London most have left the trade to which they were brought up, and the residue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drag out a miserable existence in it, because dressing-cases have gone out of fashion and dressing-bags have come in. The young laborers from the country leave the tillage of the soil, in which they have no prospect but the workhouse, for the better wages which the town affords. They better their condition by displacing older workers, and when they grow old are themselves displaced in turn. There are season industries in great cities, like dock and warehouse labor, where long periods during which the workers are not required is a regular incident of the calling. The misery of those who are half employed is aggravated by the chronic poverty of many in full work. Competition and the demand of the public for the cheapest article have produced the great sweated industries of East London, the cabinet trade, and the ready-made clothing trades, in which thousands of people work at barely subsistence wages. That this mass of half-starved half-employed workers is a national danger no one will deny. It exists in American and Australian cities as well, where one would have thought the abundant virgin soil afforded an inexhaustible outlet for surplus population. It seems a universal disease of the modern city. If there is no imminent danger of revolution, because the famishing unemployed are too apathetic, and in many cases too sensible, to give ear to Anarchists and disturbers of public order, there is a constant tendency for the class just above them to sink into their ranks and so swell the chronic mischief. In the case of London there is this further curious phenomenon, that while there are in the town hundreds of thousands of men clamoring for work and starving for want of it, there are in the country within thirty miles of town thousands of acres of land lying derelict, and bringing forth thorns and thistles instead of food. How to apply this wasted labor to this wasted land is a problem which seems to baffle our accumulated wisdom. Some of the local authorities, who are willing to try experiments, are controlled by the colder counsels of the central government authority. The depopulation of the country and the congestion of labor in the towns go on year by year, lamented, but not stayed; and all the leading statesmen of all political parties can contribute nothing more helpful than to throw cold water upon every scheme of remedy that is proposed.

One practical suggestion has been made, which would not cure the evil, but which would mitigate its intensity, and afford some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measure of its extent—the establishment of labor registries throughout the United Kingdom. This would be an imitation and development of what the best of the trades-unions have already done for their own members. Experiments have been tried by voluntary associations, and by municipal authorities, with sufficient success to justify a continuance of the effort. What is now most wanted is some central clearing-house, where the excess of demand for labor in one locality can be balanced against the excess of supply in another. The places where there is the greatest rush of applicants to the registry office are precisely those where there is the worst chance of employment being found. This central clearing-house can only be effectively supplied by the Central Government; but the Central Government will not stir, and there is every prospect of the local movement dying out for lack of this piece of requisite machinery. It is said that the trades-union leaders are opposed to labor registries, because in a strike they might be injurious to the side of the workers as providing employers with outside labor. As long as society exercises no function in a strike, except that of keeping the ring and seeing fair play in the fight, the trades-union leaders are perfectly right in jealously safeguarding the interest of the strikers. But even if this barbarous system is to continue, there should be no difficulty in devising such precautions as would prevent labor registries from being so used.

For more than a quarter of a century it has been admitted that the law of the liability of an employer for injury to his workman was unjust. In 1880 an inadequate amendment of the law was passed, which it has ever since been admitted required to be amended. Successive governments and successive Parliaments have in successive bills attempted to deal with this question, but we still remain exactly where we were fourteen years ago. As to the workers' interest there is not the slightest doubt. Place upon the employer the obligation to compensate the worker for all accidents which befall him in the ordinary course of his employment, and from this obligation allow no contracting out. The risk becomes part of the costs of carrying on the industry, and can be provided for as such. There is no injustice to the employer, because, the obligation being known beforehand, he can recoup himself by the price of his service on his product. But the matter has to be dealt with, not in the interest of the work-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers, but in that of political partisans. The government proposal restricts the right of the workman to cases in which negligence can be proved. This was done with the full consent of the "labor members." Their motive I will not stop to discuss; the reason they gave, that they desired to insure the safety of the worker, was absurd. The employer is already liable for the negligence of himself and his foremen, and the government proposal adds no further motive for precaution. It was pointed out in vain that the proof of negligence was difficult, costly, and uncertain; that no solitary worker could face the costs of a lawsuit; that the same plan had been tried in Germany and failed; and that at least three-fourths of the accidents that took place would be unprovided for. The government, which had its trades-union supporters to oblige, stood firm. The opposite side proposed that, as the workers had to make independent provision for three-fourths of the accidents to which they were liable, they should be allowed to form societies and sell for an adequate consideration their limited right against the employer. On this the parties joined issue and quarrelled, each hoping at the next election to gain the working-class vote by the position it has taken up. If the workers had known their own interests, and had possessed enough power in Parliament to give effect to their will, this necessary reform in the law would long ago have been carried. As it is, it is impossible to say for how long it has been postponed.

Few persons deny that it is right to forbid the employment of young children as wage-earners. The minimum age at which they should be allowed to work was fixed by the Berlin Conference in 1890 at 12 years. This was done with the unanimous consent of the representatives of all European nations, in which the British were instructed by their government to join. Yet the age in the United Kingdom is at this moment 11 years, and there is no present prospect of its being raised. To have to forego the earnings of children is no doubt a burden upon the families of many of the poorer workers, but it is one which to do them justice the great majority are ready cheerfully to bear. A great number recognize that to give a good education to their children is the surest way to bring about in the next generation a solid improvement in the condition of the people. I have witnessed both in Great Britain and in Ireland noble and touching examples of the sacrifice by parents of their own immediate gain for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sake of the future welfare of their children. The trades-unions have at all their recent congresses passed with practical unanimity resolutions in favor of raising the age of exemption from labor. The difficulty does not come from that side. There are some industries in which the employment of child-labor is convenient; it is dispensed with in similar trades on the continent, where the necessity of bringing up the youth of the country to be efficient soldiers makes the government more vigilant and more exigent. But the existence in Parliament of this adverse interest is enough to make a party government reluctant to stir in the matter, in the absence of any strong popular force to propel them. So soon as the mass of the people not merely acquiesce in the advantage of education for their children, but resolve that no trade interest shall obstruct their welfare, and have acquired the power to make their representatives in Parliament give effect to their will, British children will enjoy those rights which continental children have already obtained.

If the social condition of workers was satisfactory, their class would have no greater interest in philanthropic legislation, than any other class of the community. But so long as the majority of the poor belong to the working class, and so long as the majority of the workers are poor, and are sure to become paupers if they live long enough, these questions as to the treatment of the poor by society have a special interest for them, and are generally though erroneously treated as working-class questions. Happily philanthropy has not yet been monopolized by any political party in the state, and such matters as education in all its branches, a more rational system of dealing with children who commit offences against the law, the prohibition of the letting of dwellings unfit for human habitation, the building of better homes for the people in town and country, better provision for destitute children and for those who by blindness, deformity, or other affliction are incapable of earning their own living, and pensions for the deserving aged, are still discussed without party animosity. Discussion will result in practical reform when the people whose interests are most affected have power to compel the Government to take the matter in hand, and when a more enlightened public opinion forbids the miseries of the young, the aged, and the afflicted being used by society as a convenient object-lesson for teaching thrift to the able-bodied.

JOHN E. GORST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CATHOLIC LOYALTY.

A REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE A. P. A. AND TO BISHOP DOANE.

BY GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP, LL. D.

MR. TRAYNOR'S first point is that the United States require complete fidelity to the Republic, and that the Papacy is "no less *un*certain" (though he meant "*certain*") in demanding "unqualified obedience." This is not correct. It should read "spiritual obedience." Mr. Traynor's conclusion, that obedience to the Pope invalidates the fidelity of Catholics to the Republic, is also, of course, untrue. But in attempted support he brings a passage from Cardinal Manning, which he garbles and misapplies. The words,

> **"I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no civil power,"**

which he represents Cardinal Manning as putting into the mouth of the Pope, absolutely *do not occur* in the passage as written by Manning. (Mr. Traynor, therefore, at the start, commits himself to a sheer fabrication.) This throws grave doubt on all his other extracts and references; and I shall answer merely the points he raises by them.

Furthermore, where Manning said really,

> **"I acknowledge no civil *superior*. . . . I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men,' etc.,**

he spoke of the specific case of the King of Italy, whom the Pope regarded as a usurper because of his invasion of territory vested in the church; and *not of civil powers generally*. In the same sermon, also, the Cardinal points out clearly that the church,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the beginning, enjoined obedience to the civil authority of the state, and stood side by side in co-operation with it.*

With regard to the next passage, that

"if the church can fix the limits of its jurisdiction, it can fix the limits of all other jurisdictions," and is supreme—

certainly it is, in the moral field, supreme. If it and its head were subject to any one king, country, republic, or autocrat, then our whole faith as Christians would depend on the whim of that one king, country, republic, or autocrat; which would be the same as to say that the king or the republic is God, and to establish a worship of the state as the supreme power. But the faith of Christians does not so depend. It rests upon Christ—it must be free: neither it nor our consciences may be enslaved by any state or temporal power.

But, while the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, cannot be subject to any civil power, we individual Catholics are willing and loyal citizens of the country in which we live, to which we give our allegiance. Mr. Traynor infers that the church and the Pope assert a right to depose sovereigns or annul constitutions, and to absolve the people from obedience to either. The following words from Cardinal Manning himself refute this inference:

"The civil allegiance of Catholics is as undivided as that of all Christians and of all men who recognize a divine or moral law. The civil allegiance of no man is unlimited, and therefore the civil allegiance of all men who believe in God, or are governed by conscience, is in that sense divided. In this sense, and in no other, can it be said with truth that the civil allegiance of Catholics is divided. The civil allegiance of every man in Christian England is limited by conscience and the law of God, and *the civil allegiance of Catholics is limited neither less nor more.*"—Letter to *The Times*, London, in reply to Mr. Gladstone's *Vatican Decrees*, November 7th, 1874.

Let us explain what is meant by Pius IX.'s reference (July 21, 1873) to the "right" and "authority" of the Pope, formerly used in deposing sovereigns. Under the feudal system many states and princes sought the protection of the Pope and became vassals of the Holy See. Both the people and the heads of government, then, were Catholic. By his spiritual authority and his feudal right, both recognized by them, he could depose rulers when they violated principles of faith or morals, in conduct or in government. It was a pact to which the sovereigns themselves consented. The deposing power is no longer exercised. Even

* Manning: *Ecclesiastical Sermons*, Vol. III., pp. 79-99.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were the whole American people or a great majority of them Catholic, the Pope could hardly depose a whole people governing themselves through their executives, and would not wish to do so. The attributed advice of Leo XIII. to Catholics to take part in politics and exert their power "to cause the constitutions of states to be modelled on the principles of the true church," would show only that the Pontiff desires them to be active citizens, and to have Christian principles embodied in the state. Who, but an anti-Christian can object to this? Has not all the best and most fruitful effort of the modern world been directed toward making government and society Christian? Mr. Traynor tries to show that a "papist" taking the oath of allegiance can have no regard for it, because the Catholic canon law says:

"No oaths are to be kept if they are against the Church of Rome," and that such oaths are "perjuries."

What the canon law means here is that it is unlawful for a Catholic to take an oath against his church; just as the government of our country makes it unlawful for any citizen to take an oath of conspiracy against the nation. The Church does not say or mean that the Catholic is permitted to take an oath against her and then break or be false to it, but says he must not take any such oath at all. An oath of allegiance to the United States contains nothing hostile to the Catholic Church or the Pope. Hence it is lawful in every way, and is binding upon both native and naturalized Catholics.* There is a plain code of interpretation, by which the words of men must be taken to mean what they say. This code we may call a Primer of Sincerity and Common Honesty. Mr. Traynor and Bishop Doane must abide by this code, in order to understand Catholic citizens of this or any country.

Mr. Traynor declares that Pius IX.

"asserted to himself the right to annul the constitutions and laws of certain countries, New Grenada, Mexico, Spain, Austria."

It is absolutely false. Popes do not attempt to annul the constitutions and laws of countries. On the contrary, they counsel Catholics to obey the constitution, the government, and the laws, even while they warn both states and individuals that certain laws are hostile to Christain faith and morals and ought to

* On this elementary subject of unlawful oaths, see Brownson's *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 553; Vol. 12, pp. 274, 275.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be reformed. A statement in Leo XIII.'s credentials to Mgr. Satolli, that penalties inflicted

"against those who oppose our authority" will be ratified "notwithstanding constitutions and apostolic ordinances or other to the contrary,"

is paraded as declaring "papal sovereignty over the state"! Yet it has nothing to do with the state, or political affairs. It is addressed to the hierarchy, and is a church ordinance simply. The phrase about "constitutions," etc., refers only to church constitutions or decrees.

Leo XIII. induced Irish Catholics, in their efforts for home rule, to work within parliamentary, constitutional lines. In France he has led those Catholics who were inclined to oppose the republican constitution to accept and obey it. To a Spanish delegation of pilgrims numbering 10,000, he recently said that they must uphold the existing monarchy, although a majority of these pilgrims favored another royal branch.* In Germany, although the Bismarck government had passed stringent laws against Catholics, had emptied their pulpits, deprived them of the sacraments, and exiled their religious orders, he counselled constitutional, legal agitation only; and it has restored religious liberty. These instances prove the papal respect for law and order and national government under widely differing circumstances.

The excerpts given as from Aquinas and a decree of the Lateran Council of 1215, regarding heretics, show in their terms that the church recognized the autonomy of the secular or state power, and left the punishment of heretics, who might be, and often were, dangerous criminals, to the state. To-day the church condemns polygamists, anarchists, and bomb-throwers, heretics who deny the laws of God and the church. But it leaves their temporal punishment to the state. Leo XIII.'s admonition to journalists of docility and obedience did not ask Congress to abridge free speech, but simply upheld the gentle and orderly free speech which obeys divine law, in preference to licentious and violent speech. With regard to the Pope's advising Catholic political action when religion is directly threatened, Mr. Traynor asks:

"Where in the Constitution does Mr. Lathrop find provision made

* Paris *Figaro* report of his address, from Rome, April 8, 1894.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whereby a foreign priest may define the rights and duties of American citizens?"

I find no provision in the Constitution whereby any native, foreign, or naturalized anti-Catholic bigot may define the rights and duties of citizens. The Constitution, with the laws, does that for us. It also provides for the "free exercise" of religion. One of the most sacred things in the free exercise of religion is the use of conscience and loyalty to God. In this we naturally look to the Church and to its visible head, the Pope, believing them to be divinely constituted. Mr. Traynor may perhaps look to the 2,000,000 voters whom he says he represents, as the directors or assistants of *his* conscience.

Bishop Doane, a member of the L. P. A. I., who is most emphatically hostile to Catholics, objects to our Catholic position; because, as he asks, "who is to decide the question" between a law of men and the law of God? Will Bishop Doane decide it, in case of a dispute? or Queen Victoria, as the head of the Anglican Church? or the majority of a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States? In either event, it would be decided by Bishop Doane's individual conscience, or by consciences on which he relied. Would we, on this account, be right in condemning Bishop Doane as traitorous to the United States? Certainly not. Nor has he any more right to charge us with disloyalty because we look to the Pope. Neither Mr. Traynor nor Bishop Doane brings an atom of real proof to support the latter's charge that the Pope asserts "his right to temporal sovereignty and imperial domination and universal control." He asserts a local temporal sovereignty only over the territory given to him long ago by the state. Beyond that he is bound in the interest of civilization to exercise a spiritual authority over all mankind; an authority whose sole force is in the consciences of loyal Christians.

The Constitution contains not a word sustaining Mr. Traynor's dictum that it forbids "appropriations for sectarian purposes." It does say that

"Congress shall make no law respecting *an establishment* of religion."

But there is nothing in this to restrict the people in a "free exercise of their religion," guaranteed by the same amendment; and such free exercise may involve their right as citizens to ask or vote appropriations for purposes connected with religion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bishop Doane says he has the most cordial sympathy with the theory of "definite religious teaching, *as part of any thorough system of education*" (REVIEW, January, 1894); yet he stoutly contends that *no religious* education should be given in the public schools supported by taxation of the people. It would appear, then, that he wishes the people to maintain schools which *do not give* "a thorough education." On this point we Catholics have just as much right to express our views as Bishop Doane or the president of the A. P. A. We object—with the strongest kind of right as American citizens—to being browbeaten or intimidated, under a presumption of disloyalty, when any of us make expressions favoring a system of public instruction equitable to all citizens. It is our accusers, really, who are liable to suspicion of their loyalty, for their words and actions are directed plainly against American free speech and equality.

Bishop Doane says of Catholics that "neither individual character, individual utterances, nor individual actions are the test." Why not, pray; when in his view of his own citizenship, he concedes the utmost weight to individual conscience, action, utterance? This is Bishop Doane's method of brushing aside such instances of Catholic good citizenship as Chief Justice Taney and Gen. Sheridan. Mr. Traynor's method is to assume that, though Catholics, such citizens are not "good Catholics"; which is not proof, but only false assertion again. Probably they would dispose, on the same plan, of Lord Russell of Killowen, the present Catholic Chief Justice of England; of the English Catholic Marquis of Ripon, formerly Viceroy of India and now Secretary of State for the Colonies; and of Justice White, an American Catholic recently appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States. But such an assertion attacks the good faith and loyalty of the governments and nations themselves. The eminent men referred to are good and practical Catholics. If, then, Catholic religion and character are disloyal to the state, have the realm of Great Britain and the President and Senate of the United States acted treasonably in giving them public office of the highest trust? According to Bishop Doane's and the A. P. A.'s theory that Catholicity involves disloyalty, must not the French government be denounced as traitorous toward France, for honoring their dead president, Carnot, with Catholic services, and asking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other nations to do the same? But this would be preposterous; and so is the theory.

Mr. Traynor wishes that "a person of some authority in the Papal Church" would make an utterance "to be placed on record to stand for all time." Such an utterance was made by Archbishop Corrigan, June 3, 1894, in a sermon at the Cathedral in New York, as follows:

"Love for what is true and right is the only principle that should guide the life of individual, state, and church. For years the enemies of the church have asserted that it was the slave of ambition for temporal power. The fact is and always has been just the contrary. The church has ever been on the side of right, and has never curried favor for power in temporal affairs. Neither has it ever fostered rebellion. On the contrary it has always been the right hand of the state, enforcing obedience and supporting the rightful exercise of power."—*Catholic News* report.

Finally, in one of the very encyclicals that Mr. Traynor alludes to with such off-hand familiarity, occurs this decisive passage:

"God has divided the charge of the human race between two powers, the eccleisastical and the civil, one set over divine things and the other over human things. Each is supreme in its own kind; *each has certain limits within which it is restricted.* . . . Whatsoever in human affairs is in any manner sacred, pertaining to the salvation of souls or the worship of God and the like, belongs to the church. *But all other things which are embraced in the civil or political order are rightly subject to the State.*"—Encyclical on the Christian State, November 1st, 1885.

These extracts answer Mr. Traynor's inquiry whether there are not bishops who can speak for the papacy.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BY THE HON. HANNIS TAYLOR, UNITED STATES MINISTER TO SPAIN.

IN his admirable article under the above title, which appeared in the March number of the REVIEW, the Hon. Hilary A. Herbert has said, with his usual force and clearness, all that can be said in favor of the efficiency of the legislative machinery employed by the House of Representatives as contrasted with that employed by the House of Commons. There can be no question of the soundness of Mr. Herbert's main conclusion that, despite the hostile criticism often directed by the press against the *personnel* of the House of Representatives, it is nevertheless true that the body as a whole may challenge comparison for integrity, fidelity, industry, and ability with any similar body in the world; that "taken altogether there can be no better guaranty of the capacity of the people of the United States for self-government than the character of the men they send to Washington to make their laws." But after that admission has been made the fact remains that, notwithstanding the high average of personal excellence which characterizes its individual members, there is a widespread and long-standing conviction that the House, in its corporate capacity, does not efficiently and promptly dispose of the great and complicated mass of legislative work yearly cast upon it,—a conviction which accounts for Mr. Herbert's opening statement that "the one factor in the American government that is subjected to more adverse criticism than all others combined is the House of Representatives." Since the close of the civil war there has been a growing conviction upon the part of the American people that there is something radically wrong with the procedure of our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular chamber, and that some sweeping reform or readjustment must be made in order to increase its efficiency. One class of critics have contented themselves with simply depreciating the character and ability of the members themselves, while another and more thoughtful class have fancied that the desired end can only be attained through the substitution of the English cabinet system in the place of our American committee system. After many years of patient investigation into the origin, growth, and practical workings of English and American parliamentary assemblies, the writer has been forced to conclude that the growing inability of the House of Representatives to do all that is required of it cannot be traced to personal deficiencies upon the part of its members, neither is the remedy for such evils as do exist to be found in the sweeping change which certain theorists have advocated.

The most remarkable trait which our federal constitution has so far developed is its elasticity—its wonderful capacity to grow and to expand with the growth of the nation, and to adapt itself to new conditions, without organic change in the instrument itself. This good result is the product of a foresight which was wise enough to intrust to Congress a range of legislative action sufficiently wide for the task of adaptation and readjustment imposed by a national development so vast and rapid as to have no parallel in history. The constitutional power given to Congress to regulate its own procedure is broad enough to enable it to so reorganize and readjust its relations with the Executive as to secure all the practical advantages of the English cabinet system without more than a modification of the American committee system which has become part and parcel of our political life.

When we remember that the House of Representatives is really the workshop of the constitution, it is surprising to see how well it handles the vast amount of business which of late years has been cast upon it by means of the old and now inadequate machinery with which the fathers equipped it. When the first Congress met, the population of the United States was about three millions and a half, and the total number of bills offered in that Congress was less than three hundred. Our population now exceeds sixty-three millions, and the total number of bills offered in the House of Representatives alone during each congress usually exceeds ten thousand. As the volume of business in that House has thus increased, and as new subjects of legislation have come into exist-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence, the old committee system has simply been expanded by a multiplication of the standing committees which now number fifty-six, and by a distribution of the vast jurisdiction originally vested in the Committee of Ways and Means among many others. The practical difficulty which has arisen out of this system of division and subdivision is a lack of leadership or directing power through which the attention of the House can be promptly concentrated upon the few vitally important subjects of national legislation which should be lifted up out of the mass, debated and disposed of in advance of all other business. The ability to accomplish that necessary and practical result is the distinguishing feature of the system of cabinet government which prevails in every parliament in the world except our own. Back of this lack of concentrating and directing power, inherent in the headless committee system, stand the unorganized relations of the Executive with Congress, which intensify the difficulty. The primary purpose of our system of parties is to secure the periodical presentation to the country of two or more comprehensive political programmes which each party promises, in the event of success at the polls, to put into practical operation through acts of Congress. The party platforms in which these programmes are embodied always have been and always will be, for an obvious reason, vague and shadowy on the vital issues. The people are always called upon to indorse generalities rather than concrete propositions. Not until after the victorious party has entered into possession of the executive power, with or without majorities in the federal legislature, does the vital and practical question arise as to the character and scope of the two or three leading acts to be offered in Congress as concrete expressions of the party platform. Under the English cabinet system no difficulty can arise as to who is authorized to transform party pledges into proposed schemes of legislation, for the simple reason that the cabinet itself is a political committee armed with the power to draft legislation, and to offer the same in the House of Commons as the official expression of the party which it represents. Under our parliamentary system a very different condition of things exists. The President and his cabinet, as representatives of the dominant party, have no special right to interpret the party platform which they are expected to carry out, neither do they possess the power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to draft, to offer or to debate the proposed acts through whose influence alone it can be made effective. They are held responsible without being allowed to speak or to act directly. As the right to initiate legislation is practically vested in the committees, the President and his cabinet are forced to rely upon their political friends thereon to draft such acts as the dominant party is supposed to approve, and to conduct them through the chambers. During the debates which ensue, the President and his cabinet can only be heard through the mouths of "friends of the administration," who speak without any official authority. The difficulties arising out of this system of organized confusion reveal two weak spots in our system of federal government.

The first difficulty consists in the want of power in the President and his cabinet (a power universally conceded elsewhere) to sit as a political supreme court, and to interpret the party platform by reducing its general statements to the concrete forms of proposed acts of Congress. The second difficulty consists of the want of power in the cabinet to offer such proposed acts in the houses as the official expressions of the party which it represents, to insist under the rules upon their early consideration, and to take part in the debates upon them.

Under every parliamentary system in the world except our own these two fundamental rights are secured to the executive as practical expedients absolutely necessary for the prompt and orderly consideration of great national measures which have a natural precedence over all other business. All existing cabinet systems except our own are modeled after the English, and that, we should not fail to remember, *has been developed since the making of our federal constitution,* in order to enable the reorganized English democracy to transact the vast business of an empire upon business principles and in accordance with the will of the majority. As Mr. Bryce has well expressed the fact:

"In 1787, when the Constitutional Convention met at Philadelphia, the cabinet system of government was in England still unmature. It was so unmature that its true nature had not been perceived."*

The fathers had therefore no opportunity to see the workings of the English constitution in its modern form, they had no knowledge of the advantages of cabinet government as now understood, and consequently it cannot be assumed that they re-

* *The American Commonwealth*, vol. 1, p. 273.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jected it as unsuitable to our condition. For the want of something better they equipped the two houses with the legislative machinery known as the committee system; and in the early days, when the volume of legislative work was very small, that system was adequate. But the original conditions have wholly changed; the growth of population has been great, and as Mr. Herbert has said, "the interests embraced in the legislation of Congress have multiplied even more rapidly than population." Out of the casting of this vast increase of legislative work upon the primitive committee system grow the causes which account for the statement already quoted that "the one factor in the American government that is subjected to more adverse criticism than all others combined is the House of Representatives."

The purpose of this article is to combat Mr. Herbert's statement that "every serious objection urged against its (the House's) methods by its critics grows out of *organic* causes"; and to contend that, through a brief act of Congress supplemented by a corresponding change in the rules, the relations of the two houses with the Executive may be so readjusted as to secure all the practical business advantages of the cabinet system, without any organic change in the constitution, and without more than a modification of the existing committee system. Such an act should vest in the American cabinet the three powers now vested in the council by the Swiss Federal Constitution, which are the right to appear in both houses, to propose measures of legislation, and to debate them, without the power to vote. Thus could be secured to the cabinet the all-important right to draft and initiate legislation upon those questions of vital national interest to which the Executive stands pledged. No illusion was ever more complete than that embodied in the idea that the present condition of things can be improved by simply giving to the cabinet ministers permission to sit in the houses with the right to debate, without the right to draft and offer measures which are to be made the subjects of debate. Parliamentary government is simply another name for government by party, and in all such governments party is the steam-power which drives the constitutional machinery. Under the English system the cabinet is the conduit through which the steam-power is applied to the machinery. The first step in the process is the drafting and offering in the Commons of the schemes of legisla-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion which the dominant party has promised the people to enact; the second is the driving of such measures to a legal conclusion. Unless we are prepared to arm the cabinet with the power to take the first step, all efforts to secure any of the benefits of the cabinet system will be useless. There is no lack of constitutional power in Congress to pass such an act as has been indicated. Under the proposed arrangement no cabinet minister would become in any sense "a member of either house." The members of the cabinet would simply appear at the bar of the houses by their invitation, submit measures for their consideration and debate them, without the power to vote. Such a method of communication would certainly not conflict with the maxim which declares that the three departments of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—shall forever remain separate and distinct. As all students of our constitution know, that maxim was incorporated into our system in the same limited and restricted sense in which it was understood in the original from which it was taken. As Mr. Madison has expressed it in the *Federalist:*

> **"On the slightest view of the British constitution we must perceive that the legislative, executive, and judiciary departments are by *no* means totally separate and distinct from each other."**

And then speaking of the constitutions of the States he said:

> **"If we look into the constitutions of the several States, we find that, notwithstanding the emphatical, and, in some instances, the unqualified terms in which the axiom has been laid down, there is not a single instance in which the several departments of power have been kept absolutely separate and distinct."**

In the making of our federal constitution, after the sum of federal power, originally vested in a single body, had been divided between the three departments in the limited and qualified sense in which such division was understood in the State constitutions, each department was organized in accordance with English ideas in so far as they could be applied to a "composite state" at once federal and republican. It can hardly be contended that the new and qualified relation which the cabinet (without the power to vote) would assume to Congress under the proposed act could offend in any way against a maxim which has always been applied here in the same limited sense in which it has been understood in England. If Congress possesses the power to pass the act, it certainly possesses the power to so modify its rules as to give to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cabinet that precedence for the consideration and dispatch of great national measures which is guaranteed to all other cabinets under the European constitutions. Under the committee system as now organized "the several great committees control in turn"; under the modified system proposed the cabinet would simply have its turn. The proposed act should limit the initiative of the cabinet to the few great subjects of a purely national character which should be formulated before Congress meets, and which should be promptly presented for legislative action as soon as the session begins. In that way a natural division of labor would be brought about under which the drafting and advocating of only a few vitally important acts would pass to the cabinet, while the Houses themselves would still reserve for their committees the initiative as to the great mass of business to be disposed of. Thus the committee system would only be modified to a limited extent by the transfer to the cabinet of the duty of formulating and advocating the few great national measures to which the dominant party stands pledged. At the meeting of Congress such measures would always be ready for presentation and debate as the official expressions of the party intrusted with their enactment, without the long and awkward pause which takes place under the existing system. Under the authority to press such measures to a conclusion in advance of all other legislation, the cabinet would have the power to save the country from the long uncertainties and delays which will often occur to play havoc with its business interests. Every individual and every corporation possesses the inherent right to consider grave and urgent matters and to dispose of them in advance of everything else. The mission of the cabinet system is to arm parliamentary governments with that simple and indispensable power now so conspicuously absent in our own.

What has so far been said has proceeded upon the assumption that the party in possession of the executive office, and armed with a limited initiative in legislation, will always possess a majority in both houses upon which it may rely for the enactment of its proposals into laws. But suppose a contrary condition of things should exist—that the party in possession of the Presidency should be in the minority in one or both houses. What would then happen after its measures had been rejected by an adverse vote? It is certain that the ordinary result which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

follows under the English cabinet system—a resignation of the ministry or a dissolution and an immediate appeal to the people—could not take place under our own without an organic change in the constitution which no wise man would advocate. But the hopeful feature of the case is that no organic change is necessary in a constitution which expressly provides for direct appeals to the people every two years. When periods of ten or twenty years are taken into account, it will be found that under our system of biennial Congressional elections appeals are more often made upon parliamentary questions to the American than to the English electors. It is only necessary that we should utilize such elections more perfectly than ever before as the means of ascertaining the will of the people upon precise and definite questions already reduced to the forms of acts of Congress. The inevitable result of the proposed change would be to draw from the party in possession of the Presidency more explicit and authoritative declarations in the form of well-digested schemes of legislation which the opposition would be forced to meet by counter-schemes upon the same subject. With the great issues thus formulated and crystallized, our Congressional elections would soon become, in a sense which they have never been before, real battles of ideas, in which the electors would have the opportunity to give not simply a general vote of confidence in a man, but a pointed expression of approval or disapproval of well-understood schemes of legislation. The fact that under the proposed plan the ministers would always remain in office until the end of their terms, after an adverse vote upon the measures offered by them, would be no drawback whatever. Such is the rule under the Constitution of the Swiss Confederation, which, from its federal character, is strikingly like our own. As Mr. Freeman has expressed it:

"The Swiss Federal Constitution has several points of likeness with that of America, and the constitution of the two houses of the Federal legislature is clearly borrowed from the American model."*

Under the Swiss system the executive power is vested, not in a president, but in a council or cabinet of seven which holds office for three years. The Council apportions the departments of state among its own members, and "the members of the Council have the right to speak and make proposals in either house of the federal legislature, but not to vote." † When the measures pro-

* Essay Upon Presidential Government.

† *Ibid.* The Swiss President is simply President of the Council.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed by the Swiss ministers are defeated in the legislature, they simply return to their desks and go on with the business of their departments, a form of procedure which has stood the test of experience. We have therefore a most satisfactory precedent upon the one vital point at which we must depart from the English model. The Swiss constitution, like our own, is federal; and its federal legislature consists of two chambers. The Swiss executive Council or cabinet holds for three years instead of four; the Swiss ministers possess the right to sit in either house, to initiate legislation and to debate, without the right to vote; and when the vote upon measures proposed by them is adverse, they remain in office until the end of their terms. It is therefore perfectly practicable for us, by means of a brief act of Congress coupled with a corresponding modification of the rules, to engraft upon our headless committee system the two efficient business principles which distinguish the English cabinet system; and then at the point of departure from that system we can save ourselves from any organic change by appealing to the people in the old way at the congressional elections. That such a modified cabinet system —under which the ministers may sit in the chambers with the right to initiate legislation and to debate, without the right to vote, and without losing office upon an adverse vote—works well in practice is fully established by the experience of a federal system strikingly like our own.

A careful review of the whole matter must lead to the conclusion that the House of Representatives has been for a long time subjected, as Mr. Herbert says, to more adverse criticism than all other departments of the government combined, simply because there are in fact radical defects in its now inadequate machinery which inflict serious inconveniences upon the legislative business of the country. The nation continues to complain simply because there is something to be amended. The trouble so far has been in mistaking the real cause of the difficulty, in attributing the vices inherent in a system to personal deficiencies upon the part of men. Any hopeful effort at improvement must begin with a correct diagnosis which will indicate with unerring precision the points at which the friction occurs. In readjusting the machinery of a system like our own, which is to a great extent an adaptation of another to new conditions, it is certainly wise to look to the subsequent developments of that other for light and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guidance. And yet in adapting English institutions to our wants we must remember as the fathers did that they can only be applied so far as our special circumstances warrant in the light of that principle, inherent in the race, which commends judicious amendments suggested by experience rather than novel experiments based upon *à-priori* principles. The suggested readjustment of our legislative machinery in its relations with the Executive through congressional action only, fortified as it is at every step by precedent and example, complies with every condition which the most conservative reformer may impose.

The good results which would surely flow as collateral consequences from the proposed change could not fail to be considerable. The improvement would begin with the national platforms, which would naturally become more precise and definite in view of the fact that the cabinet of the victorious party, as its official organ, would be at once called upon to transform its pledges into acts of Congress. The right of such a body to speak officially for the dominant party, and to construe its generalities, could not fail to improve a political system which now scatters at the very point at which it should concentrate. And then the character of the work to be performed by the cabinet ministers in drafting and debating the great national measures of legislation would certainly draw into those offices the very wisest and most experienced statesmen the country could furnish. Every President would be forced to surround himself with a trained fighting force in which untried men could find no place. The debates would inevitably bring into collision the great minds of the opposing parties in a much more pointed manner than at present, and the people would witness the proceedings with a keener interest and a far more perfect understanding. When the measures of the Executive were approved by the houses, everybody would understand where the credit of authorship belonged. In the event of defeat the hostile majority would be forced to offer counter-measures, for which it would become directly responsible. In that way definite and well-understood issues would be made up for the judgment of the electors at the next congressional election. And thus the whole system would become more quickly and more surely responsive than ever before to the touch of public opinion.

HANNIS TAYLOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMER VISITORS.

BY CATHERINE B. SELDEN.

FORMERLY it was the "summer boarder" whose claims had to be met and whose delinquencies sometimes attracted public attention. Within the past few years, however, the number of those who own country homes, and who entertain their friends in their rural retreats, has so greatly increased that the summer visitor has become as conspicuous a member of society as his forerunner the boarder. It is to this class that a few words of warning as well as encouragement may now be judiciously directed, for the season is here when the host and guest alike need not only the spur of good intention, but the bridle of discretion.

There are undoubtedly many complications connected with entertaining in the city; but on the whole it is comparatively simple, for in most cases the visitor is only a "mealer," and when the repast is ended solicitude for the time being is over. In the country, however, it is quite different. In addition to the endless succession of meals there is the need of providing an uninterrupted series of amusements.

Since visiting is getting to be more and more a feature of country life, it behooves the housekeeper to make more systematic provision for it. It is her duty to learn what it may be expected to give, and recognize the sources of pleasure and pain involved in this phase of social life. In the country artificial aids to enjoyment, compared with those of the city, are exceedingly limited. Therefore people are thrown upon nature and upon their own wealth of resources for enlivenment; and unless they have a natural or acquired aptitude for self-entertainment they should not frequent the houses of those who would like to conduct their lives on another basis than the glare and noise of an electric

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lighted existence. It is but natural and human that persons of social instincts should wish to enjoy the society of their friends, and for the kind-hearted to wish to do everything in their power to make their visits pleasant; but the guests should see that their demands are not too rigorous. They should not rest satisfied with being "something between a hindrance and a help," but they should coöperate actively with the hostess in contributing to the pleasure of all.

However willing the American man may be to play well his part in social matters, he is seldom the star of the company. His anxious preoccupation with the world of business makes him only too glad to transfer all social cares and responsibilities to his wife, sometimes even relinquishing his rights and duties so far as to seem almost like a guest in his own house. It is therefore to the wife rather than to the husband that we must look for the "endurance, foresight, strength, and skill" to minister to the pleasure-seeking voyagers who take ship upon the summer sea of adventure; many of whom, be it said, are so driven by the exigencies of our feverish life as to be the unhappy victims of physical depression or what is known as "brain fatigue." The hostess of even limited experience is quite accustomed to hear from the lips of the newly arrived visitor, "I am tired to death," and a day or two later the remarks: "I was never so dull in all my life," "I could sleep the whole day," "I have the appetite of an anaconda."

Intimations of physical exhaustion such as the above are far from being prophetic of anything that is *fête*-like or exhilarating. But better things might be hoped for if those who are thus afflicted would only conduct themselves wisely.

It is very easy for visitors of any penetration, if they once admit the importance of so doing, to become informed of the habits of the household with which they may temporarily be thrown, not only as regards the mere externals, but so far as the temper, the house *geist*, is concerned, the order of thought, its serious occupations, and its amusements. Furthermore if servants are not abundant, a willingness might be shown to lend a helping hand, not obtrusively, but effectively, and without being officious to assume some small share of the family burdens as well as the lion's share of its pleasures. Many things may be avoided which give trouble, and some things done to save it. There is also room for the display of a nice tact in ceasing to be a guest and becoming a mem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber of the household by means of a sympathetic understanding of its needs and desires.

The foregoing requirements may seem to make a heavy demand upon the casual visitor who comes but for a few days or a week at most. The duty resting upon such as these is light, and may be reduced to a few simple rules. To such an one it may be said, make yourself as agreeable as within you lies. Avoid looking as if you expected some novel entertainment every moment. In other words banish from your face the "What next?" expression and go at the appointed time, not with an injured and aggrieved air, but with the countenance of one who has had good measure at least, even if it has not been pressed down or is not running over. Absent yourself in your own room or out of doors a part of each day. Now every man and woman should have either some duty or pleasure which makes it necessary for their own well-being to withdraw themselves at least for a part of each day from the companionship and the presence of others. They should affect an occupation if they have it not, and invent an excuse, if necessary, for leaving those about them to seek the refreshment of solitude and systematic work. For a visitor to be *en evidence* from nine in the morning until eleven at night is too exhausting to the mental resources of any but the most gifted of mortals. There are few who can stand the test of so reckless a demand upon the wealth of the spirit; and such devitalizing practices can only be in harmony with the lives of those who lead an utterly purposeless and wasteful existence. It is the disregard of this feeling which sometimes makes the life of the hostess a state of bondage, so that missing her natural freedom her hospitable motive is quenched; not from any failing on her part, but from the lack of consideration on the part of others. Every right minded woman is prepared to give her guests the best that is in her, but she should not be expected to be "on tap," as it were, all of the time. "It is the part of a wise man," says Cervantes, "to keep himself to-day for to-morrow, and not to venture all his eggs in one basket."

It is only of late years that Americans, with their ever-abounding hospitality, have been able to bring themselves to the point of suggesting, by direct statement, any limit to the length of a visit; but now that the custom has become general, the designated time is of the nature of a law, and, if violated, brings its penal-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties. The hostess knows best when it is time for her guest to depart. She is well aware of the nature of her resources, and if she has used them to advantage a visit of three days may be a perfect success, whereas, if it is prolonged three days more the added hours may be utterly vapid and unproductive of pleasure or profit. If a visit of a week is anticipated the same resources are differently managed; by stretching they may become somewhat attenuated, but all the same they may be counted upon with security and used with judgment. For whether or not the hostess is a person of "cheerful yesterdays" it is absolutely imperative she should be one of "confident to-morrows." She must be able, for the peace of her own mind, to lay her plans with reasonable certainty that they will be carried out. To achieve any sort of success she must be mindful of the many small details which insure the smooth running of the household machinery. Just in proportion as all knowledge of friction or care is withheld from the guest is he in danger of erring from a sense of false security. Where everything glides along so easily and his pleasure is so amply secured, he runs the risk of forgetting the means by which such results are brought about, and he is apt to think so long as he is well pleased his going or staying is a matter of small consequence. But this is sometimes an unwise conclusion.

Nevertheless it does seem hard when a mortal has found just the conditions that suit him, to be obliged to uproot himself and journey towards a less congenial state. He must remember, however, he has had no part in making the home whose comforts yield him so large a share of satisfaction, and that he runs the risk of being included among that portion of humanity which, like the cuckoo, is perfectly willing to occupy another's home, so long as it may be saved the trouble of making its own. Such nice calculation is, of course, unnecessary in the case of well tried and approved friends, but even these, like little Joe, had best "move on" at the natural terminus of a visit. It is better to leave a regret behind, the wish on the part of our friends for a speedy renewal of intercourse, rather than have them suffer from a sense of impoverished vitality.

There are ideal visitors as well as ideal hosts. Both to entertain and to visit are fine arts. Complete success in either relation depends not only upon the power of adaptation and amiability, but upon the store of natural gifts or acquirements the individual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may possess. Therefore it is well for every one to look to his qualifications for giving pleasure under conditions which are somewhat exacting.

With all our general diffusion of instruction in America, education, so far as it affects the whole conduct of life, has not yielded its full possibilities, nor will it do so until we recognize not only moral worth, but social charm as necessary to any harmonious scheme of living. Notwithstanding the time and money spent upon teaching music we have very little music in our homes. It is almost as rare with us as it is frequent in Europe for two or three persons to join in song or play together upon different instruments. Indeed we have no songs which are the common property of a room full of either cultivated or illiterate people. It was a part of the education of our parents to commit poetry to memory, and it was their firm belief that no other mental acquisition is so unfailing a source of pleasure and inspiration. In the country especially, a well-remembered store of poetry is a good thing to have at one's tongue's end. To be able to read aloud with intelligence and skill is also a charming accomplishment and one easily acquired, since there is no dearth of good teachers. The occasions when conversation naturally flags are the ones which furnish the opportunity for either of these agreeable pastimes, both of which, to say the least, may be considered more inspiring than asking conundrums. This last form of mental exercise may be classified among our national vices. It is the one kind of entertainment that is seldom lacking either at the boarding-house table or on the verandas of country homes.

In conclusion it is almost needless to say that reticence on the part of visitors concerning what they may have seen and heard in the houses of others is of the nature of a sacred obligation. Under certain circumstances it is even well to have "cobwebs in one's eyes" and cotton in one's ears. The family is very much at the mercy of the sojourner, and for this reason, if for none other, the order of living should be one of dignified reserve. The presence of a congenial guest is a great help towards maintaining a seemly plan of life. It is apt to check the unnecessary discussion of personal matters and to direct the conversation into wider channels than the petty interests into which the family talk too often flows.

C. B. SELDEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN DEFENCE OF HARRIET SHELLEY.

BY MARK TWAIN.

II.

THE year 1813 is just ended now, and we step into 1814.

To recapitulate: how much of Cornelia's society has Shelley had, thus far? Portions of August and September, and four days of July. That is to say, he has had opportunity to enjoy it, more or less, during that brief period. Did he want some more of it? We must fall back upon history, and then go to conjecturing.

"In the early part of the year 1814, Shelley was a frequent visitor at Bracknell."

"Frequent" is a cautious word, in this author's mouth; the very cautiousness of it, the vagueness of it, provokes suspicion; it makes one suspect that this frequency was more frequent than the mere common every-day kinds of frequency which one is in the habit of averaging up with the unassuming term "frequent." I think so because they fixed up a bedroom for him in the Boinville house. One doesn't need a bedroom if one is only going to run over now and then in a disconnected way to respond like a tremulous instrument to every breath of passion or of sentiment and rub up one's Italian poetry a little.

The young wife was not invited, perhaps. If she was, she most certainly did not come, or she would have straightened the room up; the most ignorant of us knows that a wife would not endure a room in the condition in which Hogg found this one when he occupied it one night. Shelley was away—why, nobody can divine. Clothes were scattered about, there were books on every side: "Wherever a book could be laid was an open book turned down on its face to keep its place." It seems plain that the wife was not invited. No, not that; I think she was invited, but said to her-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self that she could not bear to go there and see another young woman touching heads with her husband over an Italian book and making thrilling hand-contacts with him accidentally.

As remarked, he was a frequent visitor there, "where he found an easeful resting-place in the house of Mrs. Boinville—the white-haired Maimuna—and of her daughter, Mrs. Turner." The aged Zonoras was deceased, but the white-haired Maimuna was still on deck, as we see. "Three charming ladies entertained the mocker (Hogg) with cups of tea, late hours, Wieland's Agathon, sighs and smiles, and the celestial manna of refined sentiment." "Such," says Hogg, "were the delights of Shelley's paradise in Bracknell."

The white-haired Maimuna presently writes to Hogg:

"I will not have you despise home-spun pleasures. Shelley is making a trial of them with us——"

A trial of them. It may fairly be called that. It was March 11, and he had been in the house a month. She continues:

Shelley "likes them so well that he is resolved to leave off rambling——"

But he has *already* left it off. He has been there a month.

"And begin a course of them himself."

But he has already begun it. He has been at it a *month*. He likes it so well that he has forgotten all about his wife, as a letter of his reveals.

"Seriously, I think his mind and body want rest."

Yet he has been resting both for a month, with Italian, and tea, and manna of sentiment, and late hours, and every restful thing a young husband could need for the refreshment of weary limbs and a sore conscience, and a nagging sense of shabbiness and treachery.

"His journeys after what he has never found have racked his purse and his tranquillity. He is resolved to take a little care of the former, in pity to the latter, which I applaud, and shall second with all my might."

But she does not say whether the young wife, a stranger and lonely yonder, wants another woman and her daughter Cornelia to be lavishing so much inflamed interest on her husband or not. That young wife is always silent—we are never allowed to hear from her. She must have opinions about such things, she cannot be indifferent, she must be approving or disapproving, surely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she would speak if she were allowed—even to-day and from her grave she would, if she could, I think—but we get only the other side, they keep her silent always.

"He has deeply interested us. In the course of your intimacy he must have made you feel what we now feel for him. He is seeking a house close to us—"

Ah—he is not close enough yet, it seems—

"and if he succeeds we shall have an additional motive to induce you to come among us in the summer."

The reader would puzzle a long time and not guess the biographer's comment upon the above letter. It is this;

"These sound like words of a considerate and judicious friend."

That is what he thinks. That is, it is what he thinks he thinks. No, that is not quite it: it is what he thinks he can stupefy a particularly and unspeakably dull reader into thinking it is what he thinks. He makes that comment with the knowledge that Shelley is in love with this woman's daughter, and that it is because of the fascinations of these two that Shelley has deserted his wife—for this month, considering all the circumstances, and his new passion, and his employment of the time, amounted to desertion; that is its rightful name. We cannot know how the wife regarded it and felt about it; but if she could have read the letter which Shelley was writing to Hogg four or five days later, we could guess her thought and how she felt. Hear him:

. . . . . .

"I have been staying with Mrs. Boinville for the last month; I have escaped, in the society of all that philosophy and friendship combine, from the dismaying solitude of myself."

It is fair to conjecture that he was feeling ashamed.

"They have revived in my heart the expiring flame of life. I have felt myself translated to a paradise which has nothing of mortality but its transitoriness; my heart sickens at the view of that necessity which will quickly divide me from the delightful tranquillity of this happy home—for it has become my home.

. . . . . .

"Eliza is still with us—not here!—but will be with me when the infinite malice of destiny forces me to depart."

Eliza is she who blocked that game—the game in London—the one where we were purposing to dine every night with one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the "three charming ladies" who fed tea and manna and late hours to Hogg at Bracknell.

Shelley could send Eliza away, of course; could have cleared her out long ago if so minded, just as he had previously done with a predecessor of hers whom he had first worshipped and then turned against; but perhaps she was useful there as a thin excuse for staying away himself.

"I am now but little inclined to contest this point. I certainly hate her with all my heart and soul. . . .

"It is a sight which awakens an inexpressible sensation of disgust and horror, to see her caress my poor little Ianthe, in whom I may hereafter find the consolation of sympathy. I sometimes feel faint with the fatigue of checking the overflowings of my unbounded abhorrence for this miserable wretch. But she is no more than a blind and loathsome worm, that cannot see to sting."

"I have begun to learn Italian again. . . . Cornelia assists me in this language. Did I not once tell you that I thought her cold and reserved? She is the reverse of this, as she is the reverse of everything bad. She inherits all the divinity of her mother. . . . I have sometimes forgotton that I am not an inmate of this delightful home,—that a time will come which will cast me again into the boundless ocean of abhorred society.

"I have written nothing but one stanza, which has no meaning, and that I have only written in thought:

Thy dewy looks sink in my breast;
Thy gentle words stir poison there;
Thou hast disturbed the only rest
That was the portion of despair.
Subdued to duty's hard control,
I could have borne my wayward lot:
The chains that bind this ruined soul
Had cankered then, but crushed it not.

"This is the vision of a delirious and distempered dream, which passes away at the cold clear light of morning. Its surpassing excellence and exquisite perfections have no more reality than the color of an autumnal sunset."

Then it did not refer to his wife. That is plain; otherwise he would have said so. It is well that he explained that it has no meaning, for if he had not done that, the previous soft references to Cornelia and the way he has come to feel about her now would make us think she was the person who had inspired it while teaching him how to read the warm and ruddy Italian poets during a month.

The biography observes that portions of this letter "read like the tired moaning of a wounded creature." Guesses at the nature of the wound are permissible; we will hazard one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Read by the light of Shelley's previous history, his letter seems to be the cry of a tortured conscience. Until this time it was a conscience that had never felt a pang or known a smirch. It was the conscience of one who, until this time, had never done a dishonorable thing, or an ungenerous, or cruel, or treacherous thing, but was now doing all of these, and was keenly aware of it. Up to this time Shelley had been master of his nature, and it was a nature which was as beautiful and as nearly perfect as any merely human nature may be. But he was drunk, now, with a debasing passion, and was not himself. There is nothing in his previous history that is in character with the Shelley of this letter. He had done boyish things, foolish things, even crazy things, but never a thing to be ashamed of. He had done things which one might laugh at, but the privilege of laughing was limited always to the thing itself; you could not laugh at the motive back of it—that was high, that was noble. His most fantastic and quixotic acts had a purpose back of them which made them fine, often great, and made the rising laugh seem profanation and quenched it; quenched it, and changed the impulse to homage. Up to this time he had been loyalty itself, where his obligations lay—treachery was new to him; he had never done an ignoble thing—baseness was new to him; he had never done an unkind thing—that also was new to him.

This was the author of that letter, this was the man who had deserted his young wife and was lamenting, because he must leave another woman's house which had become a "home" to him, and go away. Is he lamenting *mainly* because he must go back to his wife and child? No, the lament is mainly for what he is to leave behind him. The physical comforts of the house? No, in his life he had never attached importance to such things. Then the thing which he grieves to leave is narrowed down to a person—to the person whose "dewy looks" had sunk into his breast, and whose seducing words had "stirred poison there."

He was ashamed of himself, his conscience was upbraiding him. He was the slave of a degrading love; he was drunk with his passion, the real Shelley was in temporary eclipse. This is the verdict which his previous history must certainly deliver upon this episode, I think.

One must be allowed to assist himself with conjectures like these when trying to find his way through a literary swamp which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has so many misleading fingerboards up as this book is furnished with.

We have now arrived at a part of the swamp where the difficulties and perplexities are going to be greater than any we have yet met with—where, indeed, the fingerboards are multitudinous, and the most of them pointing diligently in the wrong direction. We are to be told by the biography why Shelley deserted his wife and child and took up with Cornelia Turner and Italian. It was not on account of Cornelia's sighs and sentimentalities and tea and manna and late hours and soft and sweet and industrious enticements; no, it was because "his happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death."

It had been wounded and bruised almost to death, in this way:

1st. Harriet persuaded him to set up a carriage.

2d. After the intrusion of the baby, Harriet stopped reading aloud and studying.

3d. Harriet's walks with Hogg "commonly conducted us to some fashionable bonnet-shop."

4th. Harriet hired a wet-nurse.

5th. When an operation was being performed upon the baby, "Harriet stood by, narrowly observing all that was done, but, to the astonishment of the operator, betraying not the smallest sign of emotion."

6th. Eliza Westbrook, sister-in-law, was still of the household.

The evidence against Harriet Shelley is all in; there is no more. Upon these six counts she stands indicted of the crime of driving her husband into that sty at Bracknell; and this crime, by these helps, the biographical prosecuting attorney has set himself the task of proving upon her.

Does the biographer *call* himself the attorney for the prosecution? No, only to himself, privately; publicly he is the passionless, disinterested, impartial judge on the bench. He holds up his judicial scales before the world, that all may see; and it all tries to look so fair that a blind person would sometimes fail to see him slip the false weights in.

Shelley's happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death, first, because Harriet had persuaded him to set up a carriage. I cannot discover that any evidence is offered that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she asked him to set up a carriage. Still, if she did, was it a heavy offence? Was it unique? Other young wives had committed it before, others have committed it since. Shelley had dearly loved her in those London days; possibly he set up the carriage gladly to please her; affectionate young husbands do such things. When Shelley ran away with another girl, by and bye, this girl persuaded him to pour the price of many carriages and many horses down the bottomless well of her father's debts, but this impartial judge finds no fault with that. Once she appeals to Shelley to raise money—necessarily by borrowing, there was no other way—to pay her father's debts with at a time when Shelley was in danger of being arrested and imprisoned for his own debts; yet the good judge finds no fault with her even for this.

First and last, Shelley emptied into that rapacious mendicant's lap a sum which cost him—for he borrowed it at ruinous rates—from eighty to one hundred thousand dollars. But it was Mary Godwin's papa, the supplications were often sent through Mary, the good judge is Mary's strenuous friend, so Mary gets no censures. On the continent *Mary rode in her private carriage*, built, as Shelley boasts, "by one of the best makers in Bond street," yet the good judge makes not even a passing comment on this iniquity. Let us throw out Count No. 1, against Harriet Shelley, as being far-fetched and frivolous.

Shelley's happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death, secondly, because Harriet's studies "had dwindled away to nothing, Bysshe had ceased to express any interest in them." At what time was this? It was when Harriet "had fully recovered from the fatigue of her first effort of maternity, . . . and *was now in full force, vigor* and effect." Very well, the baby was born two days before the close of June. It took the mother a month to get back her full force, vigor and effect, this brings us to July 27th and the deadly Cornelia. If a wife of eighteen is studying with her husband and he gets smitten with another woman, isn't he likely to lose interest in his wife's studies for *that* reason, and is not his wife's interest in her studies likely to languish for the *same* reason? Would not the mere sight of those books of hers sharpen the pain that is in her heart? This sudden breaking down of a mutual intellectual interest of two years' standing is coincident with Shelley's re-encounter with Cornelia; and we are allowed to gather that from that time forth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for nearly two months he did all his studying in that person's society. We feel at liberty to rule out Count No. 2 from the indictment against Harriet.

Shelley's happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death, thirdly, because Harriet's walks with Hogg commonly led to some fashionable bonnet-shop. I offer no palliation; I only ask why the dispassionate, impartial judge did not offer one himself—merely, I mean, to offset his leniency in a similar case or two where the girl who ran away with Harriet's husband was the shopper. There are several occasions where she interested herself with shopping—among them being walks which ended at the bonnet-shop—yet in none of these cases does she get a word of blame from the good judge, while in one of them he covers the deed with a justifying remark, she doing the shopping that time to find easement for her mind, her child having died.

Shelley's happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death, fourthly, by the introduction there of a wet-nurse. The wet-nurse was introduced at the time of the Edinburgh sojourn, immediately after Shelley had been enjoying the two months of study with Cornelia which broke up his wife's studies and destroyed his personal interest in them. Why, by this time, nothing that Shelley's wife could do would have been satisfactory to him, for he was in love with another woman, and was never going to be contented again until he got back to her. If he had been still in love with his wife it is not easily conceivable that he would care much who nursed the baby, provided the baby was well nursed. Harriet's jealousy was assuredly voicing itself now, Shelley's conscience was assuredly nagging him, pestering him, persecuting him. Shelley needed excuses for his altered attitude towards his wife; Providence pitied him and sent the wet-nurse. If Providence had sent him a cotton doughnut it would have answered just as well; all he wanted was something to find fault with.

Shelley's happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death, fifthly, because Harriet narrowly watched a surgical operation which was being performed upon her child, and, "to the astonishment of the operator," who was watching Harriet instead of attending to his operation, she betrayed "not the smallest sign of emotion." The author of this biography was not ashamed to set down that exultant slander. He was appar-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ently not aware that it was a small business to bring into his court a witness whose name he does not know, and whose character and veracity there is none to vouch for, and allow him to strike this blow at the mother-heart of this friendless girl. The biographer says, "We may not infer from this that Harriet did not feel"—why put it in, then?—"but we learn that those about her could believe her to be hard and insensible." Who were those who were about her? Her husband? He hated her now, because he was in love elsewhere. Her sister? Of course that is not charged. Peacock? Peacock does not testify. The wet-nurse? She does not testify. If any others were there we have no mention of them. "Those about her" are reduced to one person—her husband. Who reports the circumstance? It is Hogg. Perhaps he was there—we do not know. But if he was, he still got his information at second-hand, as it was the operator who noticed Harriet's lack of emotion, not himself. Hogg is not given to saying kind things when Harriet is his subject. He may have said them the time that he tried to tempt her to soil her honor, but after that he mentions her usually with a sneer. "Among those who were about her" was one witness well equipped to silence all tongues, abolish all doubts, set our minds at rest; one witness, not called and not callable, whose evidence, if we could but get it, would outweigh the oaths of whole battalions of hostile Hoggs and nameless surgeons—the baby. I wish we had the baby's testimony; and yet if we had it it would not do us any good—a furtive conjecture, a sly insinuation, a pious "if" or two, would be smuggled in, here and there, with a solemn air of judicial investigation, and its positiveness would wilt into dubiety.

The biographer says of Harriet, "if words of tender affection and motherly pride prove the reality of love, then undoubtedly she loved her first-born child." That is, if mere empty words can prove it, it stands proved—and in this way, without committing himself, he gives the reader a chance to infer that there isn't any extant evidence but words, and that he doesn't take much stock in them. How seldom he shows his hand! He is always lurking behind a non-committal "if" or something of that kind; always gliding and dodging around, distributing colorless poison here and there and everywhere, but always leaving himself in a position to say that his language will be found innocuous if taken

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to pieces and examined. He clearly exhibits a steady and never-relaxing purpose to make Harriet the scapegoat for her husband's first great sin—but it is in the general view that this is revealed, not in the details. His insidious literature is like blue water; you know what it is that makes it blue, but you cannot produce and verify any detail of the cloud of microscopic dust in it that does it. Your adversary can dip up a glassful and show you that it is pure white and you cannot deny it; and he can dip the lake dry, glass by glass, and show that every glassful is white, and prove it to any one's eye—and yet that lake *was* blue and you can swear it. This book is blue—with slander in solution.

Let the reader examine, for example, the paragraph of comment which immediately follows the letter containing Shelley's self-exposure which we have been considering. This is it. One should inspect the individual sentences as they go by, then pass them in procession and review the cake-walk as a whole:

"Shelley's happiness in his home, as is evident from this pathetic letter, had been fatally stricken; it is evident, also, that he knew where duty lay; he felt that his part was to take up his burden, silently and sorrowfully, and to bear it henceforth with the quietness of despair. But we can perceive that he scarcely possessed the strength and fortitude needful for success in such an attempt. And clearly Shelley himself was aware how perilous it was to accept that respite of blissful ease which he enjoyed in the Boinville household; for gentle voices and dewy looks and words of sympathy could not fail to remind him of an ideal of tranquillity or of joy which could never be his, and which he must henceforth sternly exclude from his imagination."

That paragraph commits the author in no way. Taken sentence by sentence it *asserts* nothing against anybody or in favor of anybody, pleads for nobody, accuses nobody. Taken detail by detail, it is as innocent as moonshine. And yet, taken as a whole, it is a design against the reader; its intent is to remove the feeling which the letter must leave with him if let alone, and put a different one in its place—to remove a feeling justified by the letter and substitute one not justified by it. The letter itself gives you no uncertain picture—no lecturer is needed to stand by with a stick and point out its details and let on to explain what they mean. The picture is the very clear and remorsefully faithful picture of a fallen and fettered angel who is ashamed of himself; an angel who beats his soiled wings and cries, who complains to the woman who enticed him that he *could* have borne his wayward lot, he *could* have stood by his duty if it had not been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for her beguilements; an angel who rails at the "boundless ocean of abhorred society," and rages at his poor judicious sister-in-law. If there is any dignity about this spectacle it will escape most people.

Yet when the paragraph of comment is taken as a whole, the picture is full of dignity and pathos; we have before us a blameless and noble spirit stricken to the earth by malign powers, but not conquered; tempted, but grandly putting the temptation away; enmeshed by subtle coils, but sternly resolved to rend them and march forth victorious, at any peril of life or limb. Curtain—slow music.

Was it the purpose of the paragraph to take the bad taste of Shelley's letter out of the reader's mouth? If that was not it, good ink was wasted; without that, it has no relevancy—the multiplication table would have padded the space as rationally.

We have inspected the six reasons which we are asked to believe drove a man of conspicuous patience, honor, justice, fairness, kindliness, and iron firmness, resolution, and steadfastness, from the wife whom he loved and who loved him, to a refuge in the mephitic paradise of Bracknell. These are six infinitely little reasons; but there were six colossal ones, and these the counsel for the destruction of Harriet Shelley persists in not considering very important.

Moreover, the colossal six preceded the little six, and had done the mischief before they were born. Let us double-column the twelve; then we shall see at a glance that each little reason is in turn answered by a retorting reason of a size to overshadow it and make it insignificant:

1. Harriet sets up carriage.	1. CORNELIA TURNER.
2. Harriet stops studying.	2. CORNELIA TURNER.
3. Harriet goes to bonnet-shop.	3. CORNELIA TURNER.
4. Harriet takes a wet-nurse.	4. CORNELIA TURNER.
5. Harriet has too much nerve.	5. CORNELIA TURNER.
6. Detested sister-in-law.	6. CORNELIA TURNER.

As soon as we comprehend that Cornelia Turner and the Italian lessons happened *before* the little six had been discovered to be grievances, we understand why Shelley's happiness in his home had been wounded and bruised almost to death, and no one can persuade us into laying it on Harriet. Shelley and Cornelia are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the responsible persons, and we cannot in honor and decency allow the cruelties which they practised upon the unoffending wife to be pushed aside in order to give us a chance to waste time and tears over six sentimental justifications of an offence which the six can't justify, nor even respectably assist in justifying.

Six? There were seven; but in charity to the biographer the seventh ought not to be exposed. Still, he hung it out himself, and not only hung it out, but thought it was a good point in Shelley's favor. For two years Shelley found sympathy and intellectual food and all that, at home; there was enough for spiritual and mental support, but not enough for luxury; and so, at the end of the contented two years, this latter detail justifies him in going bag and baggage over to Cornelia Turner and supplying the rest of his need in the way of surplus sympathy and intellectual pie unlawfully. By the same reasoning a man in merely comfortable circumstances may rob a bank without sin.

MARK TWAIN.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

A CASE FOR FREE IMPORTS.

THE reader need not be alarmed or curious in the belief that this is to prove an interesting statistical paper. Nothing of the kind! The free imports spoken of are not even raw material used in the world's manufactures. The chief article indeed which might be freed from duty is a thing which is sentient enough never to ask for such treatment, because it has conscience enough to rejoice in any duty put upon it. Whether you can import it or not, or whether you would wish to have it free, must be judged after you hear of the extent of the prevalence of the thing in England.

The thing to which I allude is the public performance of public duty free of the acceptance of public money. It is the doing of labor for love. Is love's labor lost? That is being asked nowadays when people wish to pay small salaries and have the energies of the salaried wholly at their call. Public work done for nothing means the employment of men who are a little independent, and independence is not always considered an individual, although it may be deemed a national, virtue. No; professional politicians say politics, and all avocations of man influenced by politics—and what is there that is not influenced by them?—should be undertaken by the servants of the public; and how can a man be a real servant unless he accept pay, and does exactly as his master tells him? How can a country with such old-fangled ideas as those involved in an unpaid House of Representatives fail to be constantly proving itself wofully behind the times? Fancy a whole chamber of representatives presuming to represent a public gratuitously! Fancy legislators who do not receive mileage money! The thing must surely be an enormity. Sovereigns are the first servants of their people; where each citizen is a sovereign the dollars should be paid to their servants, the delegates. Where these receive no pay the sovereignty of the citizens can hardly be properly acknowledged.

The late Lord Bramwell, in speaking at a public dinner of the work of a colleague, said that he "had labored as only men do in this country when they receive no pay." The observation was just, for much is done by citizens who "work like niggers," as the expression was in old slavery days, without the "keep" the negro enjoyed in unlimited food. The Commons are now certainly asking for "commons," that is their keep, a very reasonable request according to American ideas. But it must be remembered that there are not so many men in many of the United States who can afford, as "men of leisure," to give time to public affairs, as there are in England. In the island kingdom there are thousands who have little occupation but the life of club and society. It is not a reproach in England to say of a man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he has no profession, as it certainly and most wholesomely is in America. But the leisured folk in Britain have given much of their time to the public. Nor is it a case where Demos can say, "Thank you for nothing." The practice has spared Demos much money, and has been largely instrumental in securing impartiality and independence in the conduct of affairs. Although in the days of Lord North and King George town constituencies and rural votes were largely bought, yet the members of Parliament were themselves free in general from any suspicion of being bribed, and the habit of gratuitous public service has rendered the constituencies and the House far purer in England and Scotland than in most countries. No one dreams of being able to "get at" a chairman of committees, nor can a millionaire influence votes in the House by the use of money. Can this be said elsewhere? The well to be pure must have pure sources, and the sources in Britain are pure. The action of rural persons undertaking to be justices of the peace, or members of county councils, without pay, throws upon them a vast amount of travelling and hard work for which they receive—estimation and respect? Hardly. They sacrifice their comfort and often also their health in undertaking duties which are well performed by them without fee or reward. You may say that "position" and power, or the love of these, is at the bottom of this action. All human action is alloyed, but if you get gold of 18 carats are you not satisfied, and do you not prefer it to some metal that gets easily dirty as the coin which is composed of it passes from hand to hand? If you can tempt men by the bribery of honor, it is better to do so, than to attract them only by the bait of an often insufficient pay.

But the culminating instance showing to what an extent the reliance on voluntary service is placed lies in the case of the high-sheriff. The high-sheriff of an English county was a very useful, and still is a very ornamental, officer. Let us see how different in different parts of our Anglo-Saxon world the duties performed by a sheriff are. In the West he may be obliged to summon his *posse*, and, at the head of the improvised forces of order, pursue armed men and conduct, if not a battle royal, a battle republican on behalf of justice. But in the old land the sheriff's utmost duty in case of the non-arrival of the proper officer would be to see that a condemned man was decently hung. The American has fair pay and little rank. The Englishman has no pay and great rank. During his tenure of office he has precedence over every one. But note the advantage to the public derived from the habit of rendering free service. The public require the high-sheriff to pay for all the dignity of representation of justice. He must "run the show" for them. He has to engage gorgeously apparelled footmen, a grandly decorated coachman, and, more expensive still, fine horses and a first-rate carriage, besides, in many cases, halberdiers and other servants, to make the people admire the judges whose servant he is! Yes, he is the mere lacquey of the judges whom he must attend on circuit, who are hardly supposed to speak to their gorgeous slave! He is named for all this service, and, when named, must perform it. If he declines, or runs away, or sends word that he is yachting in the Mediterranean, or "malingers" in any way, he is forthwith fined £500. The office only lasts one year, so that this heavy impost is levied on many in each county. Yet there is little grumbling and very little shirking. It is considered an honor—an honor to serve the public, and pay for the public, instead of being paid by them. But the further consideration of the glory and martyrdom of high-sheriffs is too touching and overwhelming to the feelings to be longer dwelt upon; suffice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it to ask the question: Is not a British high-sheriff raw material worth introducing into the United States duty free? He would add color to the national life, and would cost nothing.

LORNE.

TOO MANY CHILDREN.

MANY of the agencies for lessening pauperism are afraid of tracing back its growth to the frequency of births under wretched conditions. One begins to question whether after all sweet charity or dignified philanthropy has not acted with an unwise reticence; whether, instead of courses in literature and theology, college settlements and missionaries should not have taught the unemployed the relation between births and pauperism. Yet both social and national life to-day recognize the direct relation of morality and one of its phases, personal purity, to political economy, a relationship which is more and more comprehended owing to the increasing development of ethics, sociology, and science. Among the problems which defy practical handling this is the most complicated. Yet it is the bottom reason why there is a child-problem to solve, why child-labor complements adult labor, and why churches offer so little consolation to the unchurched, for the churches assume that the pauperism in marriage is justifiable, while that of illegitimacy is criminal. The pauperism which arises from marriage is the result of the worst elements of character legalized. In America, where the boundaries of wedlock are practically boundless, it is not desirable, even were it possible, that the state should regulate marriage much further than it now does; therefore must the sociologist turn for aid to society in his struggle with pauperism.

Society should insist upon the right spiritual and physical conditions for birth. It should be considered more than a "pity" when another child is born into a home too poor to receive it. The underlying selfishness of such an event should be recognized, for it brings motherhood under wrong conditions of health and money. Instead of each birth being the result of mature consideration and hallowed love, children too often are born as animals are born. To be sure the child has a father whom he can call by name. Better that there had never been a child.

No one hesitates to declare that it is want of self-respect and morality which brings wrong results outside of marriage, but it is also the want of them which begets evil inside the marriage relation. Though there is nothing more difficult than to find the equilibrium between self-respect and self-sacrifice, yet on success in finding it depends individual and national preservation. The fact of being wife and mother or husband and father should imply dignity and joyousness, no matter how humble the home. Because it is difficult for society to make the unskilled adult equal to the skilled adult in morality, society is trying to-day, first by organization and co-operation, and secondly by teaching, to produce the true value of purity in its relation to the government and the individual, that neither the family nor the state should be overrun by children whose parents are not competent to care for them?

In regard to teaching, the difficulties are great. As soon as one advances beyond the simplest subjects of hygiene, one is met with the difference of opinion among physicians. When each one has his favorite way of making a mustard plaster, no wonder that each has his own notions about everything else. One doctor recommends frequent births, another advises against them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If physiological facts are taught to a large class, there are sure to be some in it whose impressionable natures are excited by too much plain speaking, while there are others who need the most open teaching in order to gain any benefit. Talks to a few persons generally are wiser than popular lectures. Especially are talks needed by mothers and the unmothered girls who come from everywhere to the city.

The second method of encouraging purity is by organization, such as reformatory homes like Magdalen and other disagreeably labelled houses; indirectly preventive organizations for working girls, like Christian Associations, Friendly Societies, clubs, etc.; and the direct and educating-by-teaching work of the White Cross and Moral Education Associations and the social purity work of the Temperance Unions. Happily those whose clear insight takes purity as nature's open law need no discourse save that of reverence, for to them purity is the mystic revelation of peace and love.

It is not women alone who require the shelter of organizations and instruction, but boys and young men. There is no double standard of morality, though the methods of advocating it depend upon the sex which is to be instructed. Men are more concerned with the practical bases of morality than with its sentiment, and with the pecuniary aspects of domestic life than with its physical and mental suffering. We all may need pharmacopœia for moral ills, yet the very intangibleness of purity makes us slow to formulate rules for its growth. Under the guidance of the wise in spirit and knowledge, much can be done to create a higher standard of marriage and to proportion the number of births according to the health and income of parents. If the home exists primarily for the sake of the individual, it exists secondarily for the sake of the state. Therefore, any home into which are continually born the inefficient children of inefficient parents, not only is a discomfort in itself, but it also furnishes members for the armies of the unemployed, which are tinkering and hindering legislation and demanding by the brute force of numbers that the state shall support them.

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

THE LATE PRESIDENT CARNOT.

"ALL that I possess of strength and devotedness belongs to my country." Those words are from a message of the late Marie François Sadi Carnot, communicated to the Chamber of Deputies nine days after his election to the office of President of the French Republic.

The blameless victim of the latest political assassination came very near being an ideal executive head of a great nation. He had many essential qualities which especially fitted him for the time and place. To his lot equally with that of either of his predecessors, fell the labor of moulding into form, out of fractious political factions, a homogeneous national spirit which would consider the interests of country superior to those of party. In the performance of this undertaking he encountered, from the first, the opposition of embittered factions incited by petty jealousies, and often sustained by impure personal motives of the most sinister and unpatriotic nature. Measures of importance to the welfare of the nation presented for the consideration of the representatives of the people, were often defeated to gratify the petty spite of a disaffected cabal. These frequent defeats of government propositions compelled the President to witness a procession of coming and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

going cabinets, which disappeared from view like scenes upon the canvas of a moving panorama.

He was often censured for not being more of a leader, and for not attempting to control the ever-recurring factional vagaries which made their appearance in the Chamber of Deputies. But in spite of advice, opposition, and adverse criticism from many quarters, he remained to the end of his career the strictly constitutional head of the government. Republican to the core, in the best sense of the word, he ever acknowledged the will of the people as supreme, and, when expressed through their chosen representatives, unhesitatingly yielded his official obedience to their commands. In rendering this implicit obedience to what he considered to be the supreme national authority over him expressing the will of the people, he carried out his preconceived ideas of official duty, and escaped accusations of any attempt at usurpation of powers which, if opportunities had presented themselves, the enemies of his administration would have made. In his quiet way he succeeded in exercising an amount of influence in the interest of good government that has never been appreciated, and, probably, will never be known. When necessary he never hesitated to efface self, but when he had a clearly defined constitutional right as the executive, he acted promptly, and, usually, with sound sagacity. It may be said of President Carnot that he was in no respect great, in the popular acceptation of that term, but he was strong in many directions, abounding in good faith, and true in all things. He was never found wanting, and never wanted without being found. He possessed a lofty and perfectly patriotic sense of his great responsibilities, and was untiring in his complete devotion to public duties.

He was never accused of being a politician of the professional stamp. Having by his election to the Presideney reached the summit of his ambition, he banished all thoughts of continuing in office after the expiration of his presidential term. His only ambition was to administer the duties of his great trust purely, and for the good of his country.

The Palace of the Elysée, while it was the official residence of the chief of the nation, was, also, first and above all, the pleasant family home. Its domesticity was everywhere apparent, its moral atmosphere was perfect, and under the guidance of the good and accomplished wife of the President, it became the living centre of a great charitable movement of far-reaching influence. Those who experienced the later hospitality of the Elysée could not help being impressed with the unaffected cordial simplicity and perfect breeding with which they were received and entertained. Possibly, never before were official functions incident to a great office so beautifully toned to the pitch of a homely welcome. The whole *entourage* was in perfect keeping with the man and woman. Both were free from any appearance of pride arrogance, or ostentation. The atmosphere around them was as sweet and pure as though born of spring flowers.

In the assassination of President Carnot we behold a new kind of martyrdom. The fiends of misrule are abroad with murder for their watchword, and it will not be their fault if the close of the nineteenth century does not witness a repetition of the scenes of the sixteenth century, St. Bartholemew's Day, and those of the eighteenth century's Reign of Terror.

RUSH C. HAWKINS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED